UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC BULLETIN
FOR
ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Vol. XII, No. 1 JUNE 1961

BANGKOK, THAILAND

UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC BULLETIN FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Prepared by the

SECRETARIAT OF THE
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Vol. XII No. 1, June, 1961.

Beginning with the ninth volume, for 1958-59, the *Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East* is issued quarterly, in June, September, December and March (instead of May, August, November and February). The March issue contains the annual *Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East.* The June and September issues contain articles and notes on subjects related to the Asian economy. The December issue features special studies and reports relating to economic development and planning. All four issues include a compendium of Asian economic statistics.

The *Bulletin* is prepared by the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and is published entirely on the responsibility of the secretariat. The contents of the *Bulletin*, which is intended for the use both of governments and of the general public, have not been submitted to the member governments of the Commission before publication.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of the frontiers of any country or territory.

Annual subscription (including the *Survey*): US$4.00, sterling 28/6, Swiss francs 17.00.

Single copies:

For the June, September or December issues—US$0.50, sterling 3/6, or Swiss francs 2.00.

For the March issue *(Survey)*—US$3.00, sterling 21, or Swiss francs 13.00.

The *Bulletin* is available against payment in local currency, and standing orders may be placed with any sales agent for United Nations publications (see list on back cover). Orders placed with the Sales and Circulation Section, United Nations, New York, U.S.A. are payable in dollars.

ECONOMIC BULLETIN FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Contents of Volume XII, 1961-62

As
a
de
re
su
ma
res
on
of
of
to
re

to
an
res
As
res
co
Th
co
be
als
re
co
vo
th
co
a
of
re
is
ea
a
sit
th
of
ac
in

pre
ses

mi

(m
of
(m

REGIONAL TRADE CO-OPERATION

An exploratory study with special reference to Asia and the Far East[1]

I. INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East adopted at its sixteenth session a resolution on regional economic co-operation for development of trade and industries.[2] The resolution recommended that countries of the region should seek suitable measures for increasing intraregional trade to make possible a sustained increase of production resulting from larger markets and "in consultation with one another, study the possibilities of a suitable pattern of regional co-operation consistent with the principles of GATT". It also requested the Executive Secretary to undertake such preliminary studies as may be required.

The basic considerations which led the Commission to recommend measures for closer trade co-operation and expanded intra-regional trade (as set out in the resolution) were set out in the *Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East 1959*. These may briefly be restated. The long-term trade situation confronting the countries of the ECAFE region is not very favourable. The rate of growth of exports of the primary exporting countries of the region has shown a tendency to fall behind not only that of the industrial countries, but also that of the primary exporting countries in other regions. The major export commodities of ECAFE countries have been subject to wide fluctuations in volume and prices. The considerable improvement in the economic growth and stability in the industrial countries since the war has not been accompanied by a commensurate improvement in the growth and stability of the region's exports. On the other hand, the import requirements of the region are rising steadily and there is a possibility of a widening gap between export earnings and the level of imports required to ensure a reasonable rate of economic growth. In such a situation, greater co-operation between the countries of the region would bring about not only a better utilization of available productive and financial resources, but also accelerate economic development and stimulate larger intraregional and interregional trade.[3]

Postwar trends and current initiatives

Postwar trends in the region. The political conditions and attitudes of the countries in the region would be of basic importance in determining the degree and means of co-operation which it would be possible to achieve. Indeed, it is hardly necessary to stress that political understanding and co-operation are a basic condition.

It is relevant to point out that, in western Europe, both political and economic factors have strongly favoured economic integration in the postwar years. Under the auspices of the Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC), postwar rehabilitation and recovery were achieved, external assistance to western Europe was organized, and trade liberalization and regional payments systems were worked out. All these co-operative activities preceded the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). A fact of basic importance is that the western European countries have realized that, in the conditions prevailing in the postwar world, integration of their economies was essential if they were to retain their political and economic status. Even under these favourable conditions, the movement in Europe towards integration has been neither swift nor smooth; the difficulties of forming a customs union, even among a limited group of countries, are illustrated by the European experience. The limited measure of integration achieved, even under the Benelux scheme, the extensive preparations required for the finalization of the Rome Treaty, the number, variety and complexity of the economic and technical problems faced in the implementation of the Treaty, the failure to form a wider western European free trade area, the subsequent formation of the EFTA by the "Outer Seven", and the prolonged and complicated negotiations between the two groups for reaching a unified arrangement, and the establishment of the Organization for European Co-operation and Development (OECD) and its Trade Committee which would deal with the relationship between the "Six" and the "Seven",—all these underline the inherent difficulties of achieving economic integration, even under propitious political circumstances.

In contrast, the postwar trend in the ECAFE region has so far been in the direction of political fragmentation, leading also to economic fragmentation. The sub-continent of India was, until the partition in 1947, one economic unit (before the separation of Burma from India in 1937, Burma was also part of this larger unit). Because of its land-locked position and special

[1] Revised version of E/CN.11/TRADE/L.35, a mimeographed paper prepared by the Trade Branch of the ECAFE secretariat for the fourth session of the Committee on Trade.

[2] Resolution 31 (XVI), adopted at the 229th meeting of the Commission on 18 March 1960.

[3] See also "Report of the Committee on Trade, (third session)", (mimeographed document E/CN.LL/521), paragraph 25; and "Report of the Committee on Industry and Natural Resources, twelfth session," (mimeographed document E/CN.11/523), paras. 47-48.

economic and trade interests with India, Nepal had a common market with the latter, but recently it established its own separate tariff and monetary regime. French Indochina was also one economic unit, until it was divided into three units after the transfer of power by the French. Likewise Malaya, since independence, has been separated into the Federation and Singapore. The economies of Korea and Taiwan, which before the war had been integrated closely with the Japanese economy, have since become separate units. The division of the Korean and Viet-Namese economies into north and south are further developments in disintegration. These geographical divisions are a consequence of the attainment by the Asian countries of political independence. To most countries of the region, political independence is a recent acquisition, and this factor would therefore greatly influence the extent to which they would be ready to surrender their national sovereignty in order to promote regional economic integration.

Current initiatives. Nevertheless, despite these difficulties, there has been increasing recognition by the ECAFE countries of the need for a closer economic relationship, and the Commission's resolution on the subject could be regarded as a landmark from this point of view. The growth of economic integration and trade regionalization in other areas of the world are steadily bringing home to the ECAFE countries not only the advantages of concerted action in dealing with other areas and countries, but also the benefits to be derived from regional arrangements.

Evidence of such recognition is seen in the initiative being taken by several countries of the region to achieve greater co-operation. Prominent among them is the proposal by the Governments of the Federation of Malaya, the Philippines and Thailand for the establishment of an Association of Southeast Asian States (ASAS) with the object of promoting economic, technical and cultural co-operation on a practical and informal basis. The long-term objective of ASAS is said to include the establishment of a common market, while the immediate objectives appear to be greater co-operation in specific technical and economic fields, including the stabilization of primary commodity prices. The Governments of the three countries mentioned above have set up liaison with each other and have established working parties on a national basis to investigate in greater detail the technical aspects of the co-operative association.[3a] They are also ready to welcome other southeast Asian countries interested in joining the Association.

Another initiative is the proposal under negotiation between the Federation of Malaya and Singapore at ministerial level for the establishment of a common market of their territories.

Mention might also be made of the study being made of the possibility of setting up a common market of three countries, namely, Iran, Pakistan and Turkey, of which the first two are members of the ECAFE region.

Need for comprehensive investigation

In the light of the Commission's recommendation and the interest evinced by countries of the region, it seems essential to undertake, as a first step, a comprehensive study of the implications and practicability of various schemes for greater trade co-operation, such as common markets, free trade areas, and other regional arrangements. It should provide the necessary economic and technical data which would facilitate consideration by governments of the merits and demerits or the desirability or otherwise of regional or sub-regional market arrangements, and other specific forms of trade co-operation.

In particular, the study should deal with the following questions:

(1) What are the different forms of common market or preferential arrangements, and to what extent and in what way would they accelerate the economic development of the participating countries?

(2) To what extent would such regional or sub-regional arrangements equitably benefit the different participating countries in different stages of economic development?

(3) What are the special problems and difficulties of countries which are relatively less well developed than others, and what special measures are necessary to advance their economic development in a common market?

(4) How would the long-term prospects of intraregional trade influence the economic development of the participating countries, and how would the implementation of present economic development plans in turn influence the future course of intraregional trade?

(5) What is the scope for industrial complementarity and specialization in promoting industries in a regional arrangement?

(6) What would be the probable effects of regional or sub-regional arrangements on the trade and economic and financial relationship of the participating countries with countries outside the region and on the economic interests of countries outside the region?

(7) How would the various technical and economic problems that arose in connexion with the establishment of a common market be solved? Such problems would include different stages of its establishment, initial membership and subsequent accession, provisions for the transition period, procedures for elimination of tariffs and quantitative restrictions, co-ordination of financial and economic policies, differential treatment of countries according to their level of development, differential treatment of goods according to the classification, and institutions and organs of a common market.

[3a] In June 1961 a joint working party of officials of the Federation of Malaya, the Philippines and Thailand met in Bangkok and prepared concrete proposals to promote economic and cultural co-operation among the three countries. The communique issued at the end of the meeting stated that the practical programmes would cover a wide range of activities which could be jointly undertaken such as technical co-operation, trade promotion, promotion of tourism, problems relating to primary commodities, transport and communications, and trade and industry. It was further stated that "this co-operation would be non-political in character, independent in every way of any power bloc, and essentially one of joint endeavour for the common good of the region in economic and cultural fields." The report of the Working Party would be considered at a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Federation of Malaya, the Philippines and Thailand in July 1961.

Scope of the present study

In the meantime, as requested by the Commission, the secretariat prepared this preliminary study which is in two parts. Section II contains a brief description of the various types of closer trade co-operation (such as economic union, customs union, free trade area, preferential tariff treatment, preferential application of quantitative restrictions), and a comparative analysis of integration arrangements entered into in Europe and Latin America. Attention has been drawn to the provisions in the agreements and treaties negotiated in those regions dealing with various problems faced in the establishment of integration schemes, and to the discussions at GATT sessions concerning them. It is believed that a comparative analysis of those problems and the methods by which they are being tackled by the countries in Europe and Latin America, would be useful to the countries of the ECAFE region.

Section III of the paper gives an analysis of the present structure of the intraregional trade of ECAFE countries, the importance of intraregional trade in relation to the over-all trade of the region as well as trade with other principal areas, the principal commodities entering intraregional trade, and the geographical concentration of intraregional trade among certain countries or groups of countries. This would give some idea of present intraregional trade relationships which is essential to an analysis of regional or sub-regional possibilities.

The Annex describes the various steps taken by the Latin American countries towards the establishment of a common market and indicates the vast amount of preparatory work (including technical studies) which had to be undertaken by those countries both individually and collectively. This information would be of interest to those countries of the ECAFE region which are interested in examining the practical steps towards regional economic co-operation.

It is emphasized that the studies are preliminary in character. They are neither comprehensive nor do they point to any conclusions. They are intended only to give some factual background to the subject and to raise some questions which will have to be examined in any comprehensive and thorough investigation.

II. POSSIBILITIES OF REGIONAL TRADE CO-OPERATION

Types of regional trade co-operation

Co-operation among a group of countries may take a number of forms, involving preference of one kind or another and entailing varying degrees of economic integration or association and of the surrender of national sovereignty. The following forms of co-operation can be distinguished:

1. Economic union;
2. Customs union;
3. Free trade area;
4. Sectoral or partial integration;
5. Preferential application of quantitative restrictions;
6. Preferential application of tariffs;
7. Long-term trade contracts.

At the one extreme is an economic union, i.e. the economic integration of a group of countries, in which goods, services and capital move freely without any restrictions and the economic activities and policies of the constituent countries are harmonized and co-ordinated. Important recent examples of economic union are the Benelux Union and the EEC. The latter, under the Rome Treaty, provides not only for the establishment of a customs union of the Six,[4] but also an economic union leading ultimately to political integration. The principal bases of the economic union, as set forth in the Treaty, include the customs union, the abolition (as between the member states) of the obstacles to the free movement of persons, services and capital, common transport and agricultural policies, co-ordination of the economic policies of member states, measures for remedying disequilibria in their balance of payments, the establishment of a European Investment Bank to promote economic development, especially of the backward regions of the EEC, the establishment of rules to ensure competition in the Common Market and a European Social Fund in order to improve employment and mobility of labour.

A customs union or free trade area, on the other hand, involves the substitution of a single customs territory for two or more customs territories, and the elimination of tariffs and other restrictions of trade between the constituent territories.[5]

It implies the establishment of a common market in "substantially all the trade" of the constituent territories; but whereas, in a customs union, the constituent territories adopt a common external tariff applicable to third countries, under a free trade area member countries are free to apply their own separate tariffs to third countries. An important example of the latter is the EFTA established in 1959 by the "Outer Seven"[6] in western Europe. The EFTA does not share the aims of political unification or the supra-national elements and institutions of the EEC. The absence of

[4] Belgium, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Netherlands and Luxembourg. By an association agreement signed in March 1961, Greece also joined the European Economic Community.

[5] Under article XXIV of GATT, a customs union means "the substitution of a single customs territory for two or more customs territories, so that

(i) Duties and other restrictive regulations of commerce .... are eliminated with respect to substantially all trade between the constituent territories of the union or at least with respect to substantially all the trade in products originating in such territories, and

(ii) .... the same duties and other regulations of commerce are applied by each of the members of the union to the trade of territories not included in the union." A free trade area means "a group of two or more customs territories in which duties and other restrictive regulations of commerce .... are eliminated on substantially all the trade between the constituent territories in products originating in such territories."

[6] Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Finland joined the EFTA under an association agreement signed in March 1961.

a common external tariff gives its members freedom to maintain their separate tariff and trade policies with third countries, while at the same time permitting them to participate in a common market between themselves. This has in particular been applicable to the United Kingdom, because it participates in the Commonwealth tariff preferences, and therefore found it difficult to participate in the EEC, which would call for participation in the Community's common external tariff. Another example is the Latin American Free Trade Association set up under the Montevideo Treaty.

Sectoral or partial integration is exemplified by the European Coal and Steel Community, which provides for a common market in coal and steel products in the territories of the Six. This is different from a customs union, in that the latter would apply to "substantially all the trade" between the constituent countries, whereas in sectoral integration, a common market is created only in one sector.

The trade liberalization programme of the OEEC provides a recent example of the application of quantitative trade restrictions on a regional basis. Quantitative restrictions were removed on increasing proportions of intra-OEEC trade. This again differs from a customs union, in that it involves the abolition of only quantitative restrictions on trade between the OEEC countries but not of customs duties, whereas a customs union would involve the abolition of both tariff duties and other trade restrictions.

Preferential application of tariffs on trade between any group of countries is exemplified by the Commonwealth countries, which extend mutual tariff preferences. This differs from the OEEC intra-trade liberalization in two respects: (*i*) it does not provide for any scheduled tariff reductions in trade between the Commonwealth countries in the same way as the OEEC provided for the removal of quantitative restrictions on increasing proportions of intra-trade, (*ii*) it does not provide for the total abolition of all tariffs as between the Commonwealth countries, but only allows a margin of preference in favour of goods of Commonwealth origin as against goods of other origin. The tariff preference together with currency and payments arrangements, investment, commercial connexions, etc., has promoted within the Commonwealth trade between its constituent territories and also their integration to some extent.[7]

It can be argued whether long-term trade contracts between any two or more countries can strictly be regarded as co-operation resulting in economic integration. As far as countries of the ECAFE region are concerned, it is broadly true to say that such trade agreements of 3 to 5 years' duration do not bring about much integration or involve preferential treatment between the economies of the contracting countries. But it does not follow that theoretically some degree of co-ordination may not be promoted by such agreements. Trade between the countries of eastern Europe, mainland China and the Soviet Union is largely conducted under 5-year trade agreements, and the exchange of goods between individual countries is planned and executed through state trading corporations in accordance with the requirements of their economy on the basis of national development plans. Imports and exports of stated quantities of goods are agreed upon and these amounts are related to import requirements and export availabilities. Arrangements for technical and financial assistance are also co-ordinated with trade. In this way, some measures of co-ordination and integration in production and allocation of resource is achieved among this particular group of countries. However, among the countries of the ECAFE region such long-term contracts have generally been concluded mainly to increase mutual trade, not to promote economic integration or accord preferential treatment.

Advantages and disadvantages of common market arrangements

It may be useful to summarize the economic advantages[8] for which countries in other regions are entering into common market arrangements:

(1) Economies of scale to be gained from larger scale of output, particularly where national markets do not promote the establishment of optimum industrial units.

(2) Advantages to be gained by establishing joint industries among a group of countries, particularly to produce heavy engineering and capital goods.

(3) Greater ability among a group of countries to cope with the effects of world factors.

(4) Advantages to be derived from joint action in the development of markets for primary commodities.

(5) Special facilities which can be given for the accelerated development of less developed countries and territories.

(6) Gains from increased productive efficiency due to competition in a common market.

(7) Gains from greater international specialization in productive activity.

(8) Greater utilization of differences in comparative costs.

The emphasis in Latin American common market arrangements would appear to be largely on advantages 1—5, while in western Europe it is on 6—8.

On the other hand, common market arrangements could result in economic disadvantage not only to the countries participating in those arrangements but also

[7] On the other hand, preferential application of tariffs on trade between any group of countries differs from the customs union in two respects: (i) it does not provide for the total abolition of tariffs as under a customs union (or even for their partial abolition) but only introduces an element of tariff preference between the members of the group as against non-members; and (ii) it does not introduce any preference between its members in regard to quantitative restrictions. There appears to be no example in practice of trade co-operation among a group of countries which provides for the total abolition of mutual tariffs but permits the retention of quantitative restrictions on their mutual trade — a similarity in reverse with the OEEC trade liberalization programme which permitted the retention of duties while abolishing quantitative restrictions.

[8] There is obviously some overlapping in this listing, since some of the items represent different aspects of the same problem.

to third countries if such arrangements are inward looking and tend to pursue autarchic policies, leading to uneconomic allocation of resources. The establishment of a common market among a group of countries will have effects not only on their mutual trade, but also on trade with third countries. It is in this connexion that the principles set forth in article XXIV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are important. It is essential that a common market does not become a restrictive arrangement.

SECTORAL OR PARTIAL INTEGRATION

The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) provides an important and instructive example of integration by sector or what might be described as a partial common market.[9] Under the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (1952), the six European countries, namely, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and the Benelux countries created a common market in coal and steel products within their territories. In respect of trade in these products, the Treaty eliminated the following: import and export duties; quantitative restrictions; discriminatory practices among buyers or among producers as concerns prices, delivery terms and transport rates, as well as measures or practices which hampered the buyer in the free choice of his supplier; subsidies or state assistance or special charges imposed by the state, and restrictive practices tending towards the division or the exploitation of the market (article 4).

The High Authority set up under the Treaty has been given considerable powers with respect to the co-ordination of investments in the coal and steel industries and the regulation of markets in those products. It can influence investment decisions in three main ways, namely, by advice, by prohibition of undesirable investments, and by loans and guarantees to particularly desirable projects. The powers given to the High Authority for market regulation are far-reaching, and aim at preventing the formation of private cartels or other monopolistic agreements and taking action in the face of a crisis or shortage. They include powers to fix maximum or minimum prices, production quotas, restriction of imports from third countries and system of allocation and production priorities accompanied by maximum prices.

Since the end of the Second World War, the formation of a customs union in western Europe was regarded by some countries as the principal means of achieving economic integration in that region. In the immediate postwar years, however, many of the ideas for a European customs union proved difficult to implement and consequently the emphasis shifted to a programme of trade liberalization under OEEC auspices as the most important means of promoting intra-western European trade. The trade liberalization programme was quite successful up to a point, and brought about an increase in intra-European trade. But at the same time in certain sectors, particularly agriculture and heavy industries, trade problems did not lend themselves to automatic solution through trade liberalization. It was in such circumstances that the ECSC was established as an innovation in partial integration or integration by sector.[10] At the time it was set up, it had not been by any means clearly foreseen that it would constitute an integral part of the more comprehensive and complete economic union which came to be established years later in the EEC. Nevertheless, for the special problems of trade in steel and coal a scheme of integration of only those sectors in the six countries was deemed to be economically sound and feasible.[11]

It was recognized that the close integration of the economies of the six countries brought about by the elimination of obstacles to the free movement of coal and steel products between their territories would contribute to their economic development (through increased competition, efficiency and more rational use of resources in the industry) and, if accompanied by appropriate trade policies, it could also benefit other countries by increasing supplies of coal and steel products and by providing increased markets for the commodities used by the coal and steel industry as well as for other products.

It should be noted that when the six members of the ECSC applied to the Contracting Parties for a waiver of certain of their obligations under GATT in order to permit the formation of the common market in coal and steel, the waiver was granted under article 25 of the Agreement.[12] This article is general in character, and under section 5 provides that, in exceptional circumstances not elsewhere provided for in the agreement, the Contracting Parties may waive an obligation imposed upon a Contracting Party by this agreement, subject to a two-thirds majority, and that the Contracting Parties may also define the categories of exceptional circumstances and other criteria as may be necessary under this article. The Contracting Parties decided that there was nothing in the General Agreement to prevent them, if they so desired, from granting the necessary waiver enabling the member states to establish the common market in coal and steel products. It was also implicitly recognized that the sectoral common market did not come within the scope of GATT article 24 concerning customs unions and free trade areas because it did not apply to "substantially all the trade between the constituent territories in products originating in such territories".

Under the waiver, the ECSC undertook to take account of the interests of third countries both as consumers and as suppliers of coal and steel products, to further the development of international trade, and to ensure that equitable prices were charged by the producers in markets outside the common market. They also agreed to harmonize their customs duties and other trade regulations applicable to coal and steel products in respect of third countries on a basis which would be lower and less restrictive than those applicable at that time.

---

9 Another example of partial integration is the Euratom, setting up a common market in nuclear materials and equipment.

10 See United Nations Economic Commission for Europe: *Economic Survey of Europe in 1953*, pp.227-231.

11 The Rome Treaty contains provisions for permitting the operation of the common markets in coal and steel products and nuclear materials through the ECSC and Euratom respectively (article 232).

12 See GATT: *Basic Instruments and Selected Documents, supplement No. 1.—Waiver granted in connexion with the European Coal and Steel Community*, pp. 17 to 22; *Report adopted by Contracting Parties on the European Steel and Coal Community*, pp. 85 to 93.

The Community submitted each year a report to the Contracting Parties on the measures taken by them towards the application of the Treaty, for a transition period of five years. The examination of these reports by GATT provided an opportunity to its members not only to exchange views but also to review the extent to which the measures and policies taken within the ECSC affected the trade of third countries.[13] Particular attention was given in these annual reviews to the export prices charged by the Community for steel to non-community purchasers.

From the point of view of the countries of the ECAFE region, the example of partial integration in one special sector by the ECSC would appear to indicate the practicability of similar integration in any selected field of economy, for example, establishment of heavy industry. It should be possible for any group of countries of the ECAFE region if they so desire, consistent with the broad objectives of promoting international trade, to examine any sectoral integration scheme. In such a scheme, a group of countries could join together to establish a joint industry, providing free trade treatment in the products of that particular industry among their territories. If the establishment of such an integration project made it necessary for any ECAFE country to be freed from some existing international commitments, the example of the ECSC would appear to show that the Contracting Parties would consider such a request with sympathy. The Contracting Parties, in granting the waiver to the ECSC, stressed the flexibility of the General Agreement and the ready support it would extend to genuine economic integration.

It is not suggested that specific and concrete projects providing for partial integration or joint industries on a common market or preferential basis among ECAFE countries are available, or can be readily found. However, the discussions at the various sessions of the ECAFE Committee on Trade and the ECAFE Committee on Industry and Natural Resources indicate that countries of the region realize that, in order to achieve the economies of optimum or large-scale production, especially in the field of machinery and heavy engineering goods, co-operation in the form of "joint" industries is desirable, since the national markets for the products of such industries are limited for a number of countries. The resolution on regional co-operation adopted by the Commission at the sixteenth session also stressed the possibility of joint projects which would, on the one hand, promote the accelerated development of industries and promote intraregional and interregional trade on the other.

Preferential application of quantitative restrictions[14]

(OEEC trade liberalization)

The trade liberalization programme of the OEEC is briefly discussed here as an example of preferential application of quantitative trade restrictions among a group of countries. The OEEC Convention attached great importance to the abolition of trade and payments restrictions as a means of promoting intra-European trade. In November 1949, OEEC member countries accepted the first formal commitments to remove, by 15 December 1949, quantitative restrictions on at least 50 per cent of their total imports on private account from the other member countries as a group, in the fields of food and feeding stuffs, raw materials, and manufactured goods counted separately. Those commitments were fulfilled by most countries by the end of 1949. Further liberalization of intra-European trade required payments and credit facilities to countries to tide over their balance of payments deficits, which would arise from trade liberalization. Therefore two further important steps were taken, namely, the adoption of the Code of Liberalization in August 1950 and the establishment of the European Payments Union (EPU) in September 1950.

The OEEC Code of Trade Liberalization contained equivalent obligations and advantages for all the participating countries, expressed in commitments to abolish quantitative restrictions on specified percentages of their private imports from all other member states and their overseas territories on specific dates. While a member country was required to give effect to liberalization as specified in the Code, it also retained a substantial degree of freedom to adopt those liberalization measures most suited to the special conditions and problems of its economy. The liberalization percentages embodied the reciprocity of obligations of member countries. The Code provided obligatory percentages of liberalization not only for their total imports, but also for each of the three major categories, namely, food and feeding stuffs, raw materials and manufactures. Provided the percentage obligations were met for each category, countries were free to choose the individual commodities to be liberalized. However, after certain stage, commodities were included in the so-called Consolidation List, and after this process of consolidation they could not be deliberalized except by evoking the general escape clause. Postponement or suspension of liberalization measures was permitted to countries in balance of payments difficulties (articles 3 and 4 of the Code). In addition, countries considered to be "structural debtors" were temporarily exempted from the liberalization obligations.

Procedures of notification to and examination by the Organization were included in the Code of Liberalization with respect to measures of liberalization and their consolidation, as well as recourse to the clauses of derogation. Procedures were devised for complaints by any member state which considered itself affected by the failure of another member to comply with the obligations.

The Code required member countries to liberalize a minimum of 60 per cent of their private imports in each of the three commodity categories by 4 October 1950, and 75 per cent of their total private imports (with 60 per cent for each category as a minimum) by 1 February 1951. The base year for most countries was taken as 1948. At the end of 1950 all countries but two had fulfilled the first of the two obligations,

---

[13] GATT: *Basic Instruments and Selected Documents*, supplements Nos. 2-6.

[14] This section is based mainly on OEEC annual reports, in particular, on chapters III and IV of OEEC 9th Report: *A Decade of Co-operation, Achievements and Perspectives*, (April 1958). Also OEEC: *Code of Liberalization* (August 1959), *Code of Liberalization of Capital Movements* (June 1960 edition).

the average liberalization percentage for all member countries reaching 67.5. During 1951/52, the strains placed upon the balance of payments of European countries by the Korean crisis and the subsequent rearmament drive compelled a number of member countries to invoke the escape clauses and consequently some of the liberalization measures were suspended or withdrawn. However, with the close co-operation of the EPU, liberalization was re-introduced after a relatively short period. In 1953 and 1954, progress was resumed, and the extent of over-all liberalization at the end of 1954 was 83 per cent.

In January 1955, two important additional decisions were taken. First, the minimum level of liberalization was raised from 75 to 90 per cent for all private imports, and from 60 to 75 per cent for each of the three sectors; secondly, member countries were required, whatever their existing level of liberalization, to remove at least 10 per cent of the restrictions on total private imports still in force on 30 June 1954. These decisions were accompanied by some new safeguard clauses whereby in addition to balance of payment difficulties reasons of "national importance or equity" could be evoked for not implementing the liberalization.

The annual progress of liberalization of intra-OEEC trade can be seen from the fact that the percentage had increased from 65 at the end of 1952 to 89 at the end of 1958.[15]

In addition to liberalization of trade in commodities, the OEEC has also brought about liberalization of invisible transactions between member countries. Restrictions on various invisible items have progressively been removed. The OEEC Committee for Invisible Transactions was entrusted with the implementation of liberalization in this field.

The above programme could not have been successfully carried out without the payments facilities provided by EPU, which was able to multilateralize all authorized payments among the member countries of the OEEC and their associated monetary areas. Through multilateral compensation, it was able to cancel out more than 50 per cent of the surpluses and deficits recorded in intra-European payments. After the compensations the net payments remaining due were settled partly through credit facilities provided by the EPU and partly by payment in gold or convertible currencies.

The EPU also provided the machinery to deal with the problems of persistent debtor and creditor positions of its member countries. Measures designed to readjust imbalance were recommended to both debtors and creditors. Special credits were extended to debtor countries, which were also urged to put through internal fiscal and monetary measures. Persistent creditor positions were met by creditor countries being asked to extend special credits to the EPU, and to take further measures of tariff and trade liberalization for the benefit of other member countries.

[15] OEEC *10th Annual Economic Review,* page 116, table 22.

An important feature of the EPU machinery was that it embraced transactions with all the monetary areas of the OEEC member countries, namely, Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal and the United Kingdom, via the account of the European member. By this means, all the non-European members of these monetary areas were able to avail themselves of the multilateral facilities of EPU. From this point of view, although the EPU was regional in membership, it provided facilities for currency transferability over the greater proportion of world trade and payments. It was thus not a restrictive or exclusive regional arrangement.[16]

It is also important to emphasize that the trade liberalization measures taken by the member countries of OEEC were generally extended to all the overseas territories of these countries. The only group not included in the overseas territories was "the non-participating sterling area", i.e., mostly non-European members of the sterling area other than the United Kingdom's overseas territories. This "non-participating sterling area" consisted of Australia, India, Union of South Africa, and a few others. Though no formal obligation is imposed on member countries to extend the liberalization measures to the above group of countries, in practice they have applied them to those territories as well. In addition to the United Kingdom, ten OEEC countries extend the liberalization measures to the whole of the sterling area.

An examination of the merits and demerits of the OEEC type of trade liberalization for the countries of the ECAFE region is not attempted in this paper. However, some relevant points may be stated. The benefits to be derived from the abolition of quantitative restrictions will depend upon:

(1) the volume and composition of intraregional trade of the ECAFE countries;

(2) the extent and types of quantitative controls applied to intraregional trade; and

(3) the readiness of the countries concerned to reduce such restrictions.

So far as the volume and composition of trade among ECAFE countries are concerned, it will be recognized that there is a substantial amount of trade between some ECAFE countries and some others, but there is virtually no trade or only a very negligible volume of trade between some other countries of the region.[17] In respect of those countries between which the volume of intraregional trade is small or negligible, the benefits to be derived from liberalization of quanti-

[16] With the restoration of external convertibility of the western European currencies towards the end of 1958 the European Monetary Agreement came into force and the EPU was liquidated. Under the European Monetary Agreement, all payments are made on a 100 per cent convertible basis. The automatic credit provisions of EPU have disappeared, but a European fund of $600 million is available for member countries to obtain short-term finance in the event of balance of payments difficulties.

[17] See, in this connexion, section III of this study, pp. 20 ff.

tative restrictions will be correspondingly small, if not illusory. On the other hand, the benefits may be substantial in the case of those countries which have a large volume of trade with each other.

The extent and types of import controls also vary considerably among the countries of the ECAFE region. Some countries apply strict import controls in order to allocate available foreign exchange for the import of essential goods and materials required for development purposes, to eliminate non-essential imports and to promote local industries. The foreign exchange shortage is the basic factor, but import control is an essential instrument in the implementation of their economic development plans. Some other countries, on the other hand, have few quantitative import controls, and resort only to tariffs. These countries, by and large, do not have many local industries, and therefore import the bulk of their requirements. A preferential application of quantitative restrictions between these two groups of countries would have unequal implications and benefits. Those which have strict controls may be ready to relax them in regard to imports from some other ECAFE countries, if they consider that such imports are in any case negligible. On the other hand, if their imports from the other ECAFE countries, particularly of non-essential items, are large, they may not be willing to forego the use of import controls and upset the development of their local industries. Then again countries which do not have strict import controls would have very little liberalization to extend.

The selection of the base year which is used for the purpose of liberalization of quantitative restrictions is also important. If the base year is one in which the volume of intraregional trade was small and import controls had already been sufficiently long in application to have reduced the volume of such trade to negligible proportions, relaxation of restrictions with reference to percentages of imports of the base period will not give any substantial advantage. Furthermore, the composition of imports has changed and continues to change over years.

Another factor is that the OEEC liberalization applied only to private imports, and not to governmental imports. Nearly all the countries of the ECAFE region which import food grains have government trading in those commodities. If government exports are excluded from the scope of liberalization as in OEEC, it will mean that the rice exporting countries of the region will derive little or no benefit from the liberalization, even assuming that, in any selected base year, their rice exports to the other ECAFE countries were substantial.

In western Europe, a large proportion of intraregional trade in the early postwar years was conducted on the basis of bilateral payments, and, in those conditions, the abolition of quantitative restrictions, combined with EPU facilities, contributed to a substantial growth of intraregional trade. In the ECAFE countries, on the other hand, great volume of intraregional trade is seldom conducted on a bilateral basis —a consideration which is relevant.

Problems raised by the establishment of a common market

Various economic and technical problems will have to be examined by any group of countries desiring to establish a common market. In the following sections, some of these problems are discussed, with illustrations from European and Latin American arrangements.

(*a*) *Membership and territorial scope* (Regional or sub-regional arrangements)

The ECAFE region is a vast area, comprising 22 countries with a population of 1,500 million or over one half of that of the world. The differences between these countries in the size of territory, population and natural resources, the stage reached in their economic development, the differences in their tradition and in their historical and political association—all these are basic factors. Obviously the establishment of a customs union or a free trade area which would include all the countries and territories in the ECAFE region, even assuming that all the countries desired it, would be no easy task. Such an idea at the present stage is obviously unrealistic. At the same time, however, it should be stated as a basic premise from the point of view of the United Nations that, assuming economic integration in the region is considered desirable, the larger the number of countries which can come together in any regional scheme of integration, the greater will be its advantages and acceptability. But recognition of the desirability of universality should be tempered by considerations of practicability.

The experience of western Europe and Latin America in this regard, and the specific provisions which they have incorporated into their common market treaties in respect of membership and territorial application, should be relevant.

As is well known, the establishment of the EEC was accompanied by negotiations to establish a wider free trade area including all the OEEC members, and the failure of these negotiations led to the establishment of the EFTA. However, both the Rome Treaty and the Stockholm Convention contain provisions which would admit other member states—only European states in the case of EEC—to accede, and which would permit the negotiation of an association agreement with a country or group of countries or international organization. Nevertheless, the implementation of the two common market treaties was started on the basis of their existing membership, leaving the door open for others to join later.

In the Latin American region, three sub-regional arrangements have been so far negotiated: (*i*) the Montevideo Treaty, consisting of eight members,[18] (*ii*) the Multilateral Treaty on Free Trade and Central American Economic Integration signed by the five central American republics,[19] and (*iii*) the Tripartite Treaty signed by three[20] of the five central American republics under (*ii*) above, independent of the Treaty referred to.

[18] Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay.

[19] Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua.

[20] El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.

Under the Montevideo Treaty, membership is open to the other Latin American States, but its implementation will commence on the basis of its original membership of eight countries. The basis is thus provided for extending the Treaty to all Latin America, but the first important step is sub-regional.

The Working Group set up under ECLA auspices to examine the subject of a Latin American Regional Market submitted proposals for the region as a whole, and based upon them, work started on the preparation of a draft agreement for a Latin American common market. (Meanwhile, the Montevideo Treaty, a sub-regional arrangement as described above, was negotiated). The ECLA Working Group recommended that membership in the regional market must be open to all the Latin American countries, for which reason it was essential that conditions acceptable to all of them be established from the outset. At the same time it recognized that countries closely linked by geographical proximity or common economic interest should be able to enter into negotiations among themselves. But it was essential, the Working Group stated, that "these negotiations be effected within the framework of a general agreement and along such lines that the reciprocal concessions involved are not exclusive and are automatically extended to other member countries or to such countries as may become members in the future if all do not accede to the initial agreement."[21] The Montevideo Treaty and the Multilateral Treaty on Free Trade and Central American Economic Integration entail the initial participation only of limited number of countries, but the ultimate goal of a regional common market for the whole of Latin America has not been lost sight of.

A question which deserves examination in the ECAFE region is whether it should be postulated as an essential basis for a regional common market that its membership should ultimately embrace all the countries of the region. Some doubt may be cast on the validity of such a proposition, if only because of the vastness of the area and the number of countries involved, not to mention the differences in their levels of economic development, political evolution, etc. As indicated in the introductory section of this paper, some countries of the region closely connected by economic and other ties may desire to go ahead first, without waiting for the formulation of principles acceptable to all. Insistence on such agreement may delay and perhaps damage the prospects of closer union among any limited number of countries. In fact, conditions in the region might necessitate modest beginnings in integration on a sub-regional basis among a limited number of interested countries, which are keen to forge closer ties and are ready to co-operate to that end.

It might be objected that the formation of several trading groups within the region might breed mutually exclusive, inwardlooking and restrictive tendencies, not only harmful to the larger interests of the region as a whole, but also non-conducive to the optimisation of global trade on a multilateral basis. Sub-regional groups might thus fall foul of both regional and global objectives. The formation of one sub-regional group would necessarily involve the institution of a preferential system which would exclude and discriminate against other countries of the region, not to mention the rest of the world. This danger cannot be ruled out as altogether fanciful, but it is one against which safeguards should be provided from the outset by appropriate policies and understandings on the part of the countries concerned.

At the present stage of international trade co-operation, the articles of GATT embody a code of principles which should broadly provide the guidance needed by the countries of the region (even though many of them are not members of GATT) in considering common market schemes, either on a regional or on sub-regional basis in a manner consistent with the objective of not restricting international trade. The discussions and consultations of the Contracting Parties on the EEC, EFTA, and the Montevideo Treaty indicate that regional integration schemes are examined with sympathy and realism, taking due cognizance of the particular conditions in a region which lead to them, the objectives underlying them and the means by which they are to be achieved. The Contracting Parties, in examining the above schemes, have attached less importance to the purely legalistic aspect of the consistency of a particular project with the GATT articles and obligations than to its larger objectives and to the possible long-term effects which its implementation is likely to have on the economy and trade of third countries. The development of this pragmatic approach to regional integration is an encouraging sign for the countries of the ECAFE region.

(*b*) *Scope of a customs union or free trade area* (Commodity and sector coverage)

Article XXIV (8) of GATT requires that tariff duties and other restrictions of commerce should be eliminated in a customs union or free trade area on "substantially all the trade between the constituent territories in products originating in such territories". What does this mean exactly? The article does not specify that any definite percentage of trade of the constituent countries should be freed from tariffs and other restrictions. Nevertheless it is possible to argue that the term "substantially all the trade" has a qualitative as well as quantitative aspect and cannot be interpreted as permitting the exclusion of any particular sector, especially a major sector of economic activity, from its scope. On the other hand, it can also be contended that the phrase "substantially all the trade" does not mean "trade in substantially all products" and that therefore the exclusion of certain products is permissible. These points of view have been presented at GATT consultations in seeking an interpretation on whether the exclusion of any particular sector from the scope of the free trade area, irrespective of its quantitative importance, is consistent with article XXIV (8) of GATT, or whether coverage of "substantially all the trade" (an undefined percentage of trade between the constituent territories) would be deemed to fulfil the requirements of the above article.[22]

---

[21] United Nations, *The Latin American Common Market,* page 30.

[22] GATT: *Report of the Working Party on the European Free Trade Association* (L/1235); EFTA: *Replies received from Member States to the questions submitted by the contracting parties* (L/1157 and Add.1).

The provisions of the Rome Treaty, the EFTA Convention and the Montevideo Treaty in regard to the scope of intraregional trade of constituent territories covered by the common market and the interpretations put upon them by the countries participating in those arrangements should be of interest to the countries of the ECAFE region in examining problems of commodity and sector coverage in connexion with the consideration of regional or sub-regional trade arrangements.

Under the Rome Treaty, all trade between the members of the EEC take place within the framework of the Common Market, including trade in agricultural products, but special provisions have been made for agriculture. A common agricultural policy is to be established and a common organization of agricultural markets will be set up. This organization can take one of the three following forms: (*i*) common rules concerning competition, (*ii*) compulsory co-ordination of the various national market organizations, or (*iii*) a European market organization. The special character of agriculture deriving from its social structure, the need to ensure optimum utilization of agricultural resources and also a fair standard of living for the agricultural population, the need to make adjustments gradually—all these are given recognition in the measures to be taken during the transitional period as well as in the framing of the common agricultural policy at the end of the transition period.

Under the EFTA, provision is made for the elimination of tariffs and other commercial restrictions on intra-trade in industrial products and in agricultural and fishery products not included in annexes D and E of the Stockholm Convention (these annexes list the excluded items). In effect, 85 per cent of the total trade between member states will be covered by the free trade area. In the agricultural sector, the aim is "to facilitate an expansion of trade which will provide reasonable reciprocity to Member States whose economies depend to a great extent on exports of agricultural goods" (article 22(2)). The additional intra-trade in agricultural products freed from barriers as a result of bilateral arrangements between the member states will amount to another 5 per cent. Thus, not less than 90 per cent of total trade between member states will be freed from barriers. The member states claim that the bilateral arrangements are an integral part of the free trade area arrangements, whereas other contracting parties take a different view.

The Montevideo Treaty provides that the constituent members of the Free Trade Association "shall gradually eliminate, in respect of substantially all their reciprocal trade, such duties, charges and restrictions as may be applied to imports of goods originating in the territory of any Contracting Party" (article 3). Through negotiations, the following will be drawn up:

(*a*) National schedules specifying the annual reductions in duties and other restrictions which each Contracting Party grants to the other Contracting Parties. (The annual reduction in duties shall be not less than 8 per cent of the weighted average applicable to third countries) (articles 4 and 5).

(*b*) A Common Schedule listing the products on which the Contracting Parties collectively agree to eliminate duties and other restrictions. The products included in the Common Schedule will constitute, in aggregate value of the trade of the contracting parties, 25 per cent during the first three-year period, 50 per cent during the second three-year period, 75 per cent during the third three-year period, and substantially all the trade during the fourth three-year period (Article 7).

Special provisions concerning agriculture call for co-ordination of agricultural development and commodity trade policies and measures to expand intra-area trade in agricultural commodities under certain conditions.

According to the Treaty, the above programme of trade liberalization in the area will be accomplished by the end of a 12-year period. It is not foreseen that actions which might be taken under the saving clauses (articles 23—26), Special Provisions Concerning Agriculture (articles 27—31), and the Measures in Favour of Countries at a Relatively Less Advanced Stage of Economic Development (article 32) will hinder the fulfilment of the trade liberalization programme under article 7 of the Treaty. Actions which would be taken under the above-mentioned articles, it is claimed by the participating countries, will always be of a temporary nature.[23]

Under Protocol No. 4 of the Treaty, the provisions of the Treaty are "not applicable to commitments to purchase or sell petroleum and petroleum derivatories resulting from agreements concluded by the signatories of the present Protocol prior to the date of signature of the above-mentioned Treaty". The actual value of such trade is said to be not significant and the trade in such products is not excluded from the system of liberalization under the Treaty. Thus, in effect the Free Trade Area will extend to all sectors and to substantially all trade of the participating countries.

The Multilateral Treaty on Free Trade (for central America) provides for the immediate abolition of tariffs on some 200 items (which are not produced in Central America and do not enter into intraregional trade), and for the list of items to be extended continuously through negotiations until a full common market is established by the end of ten years.

The following general points seem to emerge from the proposals implemented or suggested in other regions. In principle, a customs union or free trade area should extend to "substantially all the trade" between the constituent territories. But exceptions are permissible in practice, if they could be justified by the special circumstances of each case. During the transition period, differential treatment of trade in different groups of commodities is provided for, as in the case of agricultural commodities, manufactured goods deserving protection, or products of regional industries. The interpretation of the GATT criterion "substantially all the trade" is attempted on a flexible basis rather than on the basis of rigid contractual obligation.

[23] GATT: *Latin American Free Trade Area: Replies from the participating governments to the questions submitted by Contracting Parties* (documents L/1311 and L/1201).

(c) Transition period

In the arrangements for the establishment of a free trade area or customs union negotiated in other regions, provision is included for a transition period by the end of which the common market or customs union is to be fully established. The removal of import duties and other commercial restrictions on trade among the participating countries of the common market is specified according to various stages.

Under the Rome Treaty, the common market was to be established over a period of twelve years, subject to a maximum total duration of fifteen years from the date of entry into force of the Treaty. The transition period is divided into three stages of four years each, the length of each stage subject to some modification, if necessary, under specified conditions (article 8 of the Rome Treaty).

Under the Montevideo Treaty, the programme of trade liberalization is to be brought into full operation within not more than twelve years. The Common Schedule, which lists items on which tariff duties and other restrictions will be eliminated, provides for four stages of three years each.

The Central American Treaty on Free Trade and Central American Economic Integration, (entered into by the five central American republics) provides for the establishment of a customs union within ten years. Under the scheme of integration of industries, the industries selected for integration will enjoy the benefit of free trade within the region from the very outset; other industries will benefit to the extent of a 10 per cent reduction in tariffs per annum, to be completed within a maximum period of ten years.

In the tripartite treaty signed in February 1960 by three of the above five central American republics, namely, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, a free trade area is to be established immediately and a customs union is to be set up over a period of five years.

In the Stockholm Convention relating to the EFTA, the free trade area will be organized over a period of ten years, beginning on 1 July 1960 and ending on 1 January 1970. Quantitative restrictions on trade between members of the EFTA will also be eliminated not later than 31 December 1969. The time schedules in the EFTA are designed to keep in step with those of the Rome Treaty, and can be revised, if necessary.

In the proposals made by the ECLA Working Group for the establishment of a Latin American Common Market for the region as a whole, a two-stage approach has been suggested;[24] the first stage, lasting ten years, would involve a substantial reduction, but not complete elimination, of restrictions on intra-trade. During the second stage (the period of which has not been specified), the reduction of duties and other restrictions would be completed and the common market will come into existence. The procedures for the second stage are not laid down, but are to be the subject of negotiations before the end of the first ten-year period.

[24] United Nations, *The Latin American Common Market,* page 40.

It will be noted that, in every arrangement referred to above, a transition period is provided for, with stages, giving the participating countries sufficient time to bring about the adjustments necessitated by the establishment of the common market.

In this connexion, reference may be made to sections 5 and 7 of GATT article XXIV. Section 5 permits not only the formation of a customs union or free trade area, but also "the adoption of an interim agreement necessary for the formation of a customs union or free trade area". If a group of countries enter into any interim agreement for the formation of a customs union or a free trade area, such agreement should include a plan and schedule for the formation of such a customs union or of such a free trade area within a reasonable length of time. The inclusion of a definite time-table is obligatory. Under Section 7, the Contracting Parties, if after having studied the plan and schedule included in the interim agreement, find that "such agreement is not likely to result in the formation of a customs union or a free trade area within the period contemplated by the parties to the agreement or that such period is not a reasonable one", they will make recommendations to the parties to the agreement. "The parties shall not maintain or, put into force, as the case may be, such agreement if they are not prepared to modify it in accordance with these recommendations" (article XXIV (7b)). It may be mentioned in this connexion that, in reply to a specific question addressed by the Contracting Parties, the members of the EEC, the EFTA and the Montevideo Treaty have answered that the treaties in question established a common market or a free trade area and did not merely represent an "interim agreement" for the establishment of such arrangement.

Article XXIV of GATT does not specify how many years is meant by "a reasonable length of time". It is obviously a matter for interpretation in the light of the particular conditions in which the proposed free trade area or customs union is to be formed.

The advantages and disadvantages of a comparatively long transition period are obvious. In favour of a relatively long period of transition it can be said that the participating countries do not have to commit themselves well in advance to a difficult time schedule which they might find themselves in actual experience unable to fulfil, especially when unforeseen balance of payments difficulties and other obstacles are encountered. Furthermore, the longer the transition, the greater the flexibility imparted to the scheme and the opportunity given to the participating countries to examine their mutual problems in the light of experience gained in the reduction of duties and restrictions on trade and to make further adjustments, if necessary. On the other hand, the longer the transition period, the greater the element of uncertainty introduced in the implementation of the arrangements, and therefore the very establishment of the common market might be prejudiced. Moreover, the advantages of integration in terms of large-scale economies, industrial development and specialization would be correspondingly delayed.

The experience being gained in the other regions of the world should be relevant to the countries of

the ECAFE region in their examination of this problem. The point to emphasize appears to be that the transition period should be sufficiently long to permit the participating countries to undertake the necessary adjustments without undue hardship and dislocation, but not so long that it jeopardizes the realisation of the project itself. The exact time-table can be determined only on the basis of the actual conditions and difficulties faced by the countries desiring to enter into such an arrangement for integration.

(*d*) *Special treatment of less developed countries and territories*

It has been recognized that membership in a customs union or free trade area will create special problems and difficulties for the less developed countries and territories. In any group of countries desiring to form a common market, some are less developed than others and, generally speaking, in the less advanced countries the development of infrastructure and industries is limited. The basic problem of under-developed countries is the inadequacy of capital formation which can be remedied only over a period of years through building up the infrastructure, the spread of technical training and skills, the diversification of the economy, the establishment of industries and a general improvement in productive efficiency. If a less developed country accepted the same obligations as a developed country in a common market to abolish tariffs and other trade restrictions, it would face special difficulties. Its few industries would encounter competition from those of the more developed countries within the common market, and would be faced with problems of survival or adaptation. It would be difficult to establish new industries after the abolition of protective measures. Since its exports, which are likely to be predominantly agricultural, may not benefit from the common market to any significant extent (if agriculture in the developed countries is protected on social and economic grounds) and since its imports of manufactured goods might increase, its balance of payments difficulties would be aggravated. Furthermore, membership in a common market would not by itself bring about the more rapid economic development of the less developed country.

The integration of markets in a common market can lead to important gains through increased specialization and productivity, due to increased competition and the larger size of the market. Theoretically, given conditions of competition, it is arguable that the total result will be net gains in productivity, employment and income for the union as a whole, the adverse effects in some sectors and in some countries being more than offset by the beneficial effects felt by the union as a whole. There are some major reservations to this conclusion. The dislocation and damage caused by competition in some sectors and in some countries may not be temporary situations, but may affect their readjustment or development for long periods unless special measures of assistance are taken. This is proved by the familiar case of undeveloped and "depressed" regions in a country which remain in the same condition, while developed regions in the same country attract new investments and industries because of the economies provided by their already developed infrastructure. Often the more rapid development of certain areas in a country and of certain countries relatively to other countries is due at least in part to historical factors and circumstances, and does not represent a permanent condition explained by factor endowments and other reasons. It is not inconceivable that, in certain circumstances, the total effect of a common market among a group of countries may be a net reduction in investment and income in the union as a whole.

Even if the net income effects of integration on the common market as a whole are beneficial, it does not follow that they will not be adverse on the distribution of those incomes within the union. Therefore, fair and equitable distribution of the incomes and gains between different countries in the union and between different regions of the same country is highly desirable if integration is to be accepted by all.

Another aspect of this problem which has been given even greater importance in the Latin American proposals for a common market is that the rapid economic development of the less developed countries can be achieved only within the framework of a common market and on the basis of the economies of large-scale production and marketing which a common market would make possible. In the absence of a common market, economic development of the less developed countries would continue to be slow and limited. On the other hand, within a large common market, with special facilities and assistance to be provided to them, they would be able to make more rapid progress. This forms an essential part of the logical basis for regional economic integration in Latin America, and should be of special interest to countries in the ECAFE region.

The special facilities suggested or provided to the less developed countries in a customs union or free trade area include (*i*) differential treatment in regard to tariffs and restrictions on trade, (*ii*) longer period of transition, (*iii*) financial and other assistance in promoting industries and economic development. In the following paragraphs, an analysis is made of the provisions relating to them in the European and Latin American integration arrangements. Countries of Asia will find this analysis relevant to their examination of the same types of problems in the ECAFE region.

The Rome Treaty. Under the EEC, the special needs of backward areas *within* the Community are recognized, and the European Investment Bank has been established to grant loans and guarantees on a non-profit basis to finance projects. A number of projects are already being financed in France and southern Italy by the European Investment Bank. The special requirements of the associated overseas countries and territories are also recognized by the establishment of a Development Fund, which will finance social and economic projects in those territories. The provisions of the Rome Treaty relating to the abolition of tariff duties and quantitative restrictions also recognize the special position of the under-developed associated territories. While the products of the associated territories entering into the Common Market will receive preferential treatment as laid down in the Treaty, the under-developed countries may levy customs duties which are required for their industrial and economic development or which are essential for revenue (article 133).

Proposals considered under the European Free Trade Area. In connexion with the unsuccessful negotiations for the free trade area including all the OEEC member countries the possible effects of free trade area membership on the less developed countries and the special measures of assistance which could be extended to them were examined by special working parties set up under OEEC auspices.[25]

Four OEEC members, namely, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, and Turkey, recognized to be the less developed countries in western Europe, emphasized four types of problems needing special attention:[26]

(1) For various reasons it would be impossible for them to accept, without significant delay, any automatic obligation to reduce protection on joining the free trade area. They therefore asked for appropriate derogations.

(2) They desired to retain the existing tariffs and, if necessary, to impose new tariffs and quantitative restrictions in order to broaden the basis of their economies and to promote industries.

(3) They stressed the need for setting up adaptation and development funds inside the free trade area, in order to enable them to meet the heavy capital costs of adjusting their industries, especially as a result of competition in the free trade area, and to promote the growth of new industries.

(4) They are predominantly agricultural producers and exporters, and therefore expressed strong interest in the conclusion of satisfactory arrangements within the free trade area for the expansion of trade in agricultural products.

The Chairman of the OEEC Working Party examined the above problems and made various suggestions[27] for dealing with them. These are summarized below.

(*i*) *The length of the transition period.*[28] It was suggested that the extended transition period, by the end of which all protective measures should be removed, should be twice as long as that for the developed countries; this would have implied a minimum of 24 years. The transition period would be divided into three stages, the first stage to be subject to a maximum of ten years and the next two stages to be of equal duration.

(*ii*) *Abolition of customs duties.* There would be two reductions in the first stage, one at the end of the first year and the other at the end of the sixth year, the total reduction to be 5 per cent, provided all tariffs above 50 per cent were also reduced by at least 5 per cent. During the second and third stages, equal annual reductions at the end of each year would be made so that by the end of the third stage all duties would be removed.

(*iii*) *New or increased tariffs.* During the extended transition period, the less developed countries would levy new or raise existing duties only where such action was necessary to promote the desirable development of a particular industry. Any new or increased duty should not exceed 50 per cent *ad valorem* or the highest duty on a similar product levied at the time by an industrially advanced member on imports from the free trade area, whichever was higher. If new duties were imposed, the country concerned would endeavour, by means of compensatory reductions in other duties, to avoid an increase in the total of customs receipts (as defined for the purpose of tariff reduction). The provisions regarding tariffs would be subject to periodical review with a view to accelerating tariff reductions.

(*iv*) *Financial assistance.* The question of financial assistance to be extended to the less developed countries was examined by another expert group,[29] and general principles were laid down. It was recognized that such assistance was necessary and should be made available. It was also recommended that the amount should be determined and specified in the Treaty. It was proposed that the funds should be raised through government contributions, and made available for economic and social infrastructure as well as directly productive projects. A committee or managing board should approve the funds. It would also facilitate the access of the less developed countries to international capital markets by means of guarantees.

(*v*) *Agricultural products.* On the question of agricultural exports, special arrangements were recognized as indispensable for the entry of the less developed countries in the free trade area.

Association of Greece with the EEC. In this connexion the special treatment accorded to Greece (a less developed country) by the Six under the treaty of association between Greece and the EEC (signed in March 1961) deserves attention. Under this treaty the special problems and difficulties of Greece in joining the European Common Market have been recognized by the Six. Greece is given free access to the Common Market within a period of twelve years like the other members. On some of its major exports to the Common Market, the Six agree to accelerate the reduction of their tariffs. Greece is permitted to retain protective tariffs on such of its manufactured goods as well as for new industries which need protection and to have a longer transition period of twenty-four years for the elimination of tariffs. The EEC also extends a loan

[25] *Negotiations for a European Free Trade Area;* Documents relating to the negotiations from July 1956 to December 1958, (Cmnd. 641), January 1959. Section F: *Countries in the course of economic development* (pp. 217-236).

[26] *Op. cit.* See also *Reports by the Chairman of the Working Party No. 23,* pp. 30-41.

[27] The negotiations came to an unsuccessful end and no definite conclusions were reached on these and many other aspects of the free trade area.

[28] In this connexion, Turkey desired a waiver period of 25 years, during which duties and restrictions would not be reduced except those that it considered possible; however the question could be examined at the end of the tenth year of the transitional period. Greece asked for a waiver period of 20 years, with the possibility of a 5-year extension, during which no automatic reductions in protection would be made, and new tariffs could be applied to infant industries as agreed upon.

[29] *Negotiations for a European Free Trade Area OEEC: Report by the group of Financial Experts to Working Party No. 23,* and *Report by the Chairman of Working Party No. 23,* pp. 217-234.

of $125 million to Greece for accelerated economic development, to be made available over a period of five years and repayable in twenty-five years. Since Greece has important markets for its exports in Eastern European countries with whom it has entered into bilateral agreements, it has been permitted to extend tariff quotas to those countries. Under the treaty of association Greece will have a distinct constitutional position, unlike the Six which are full members. Greece, otherwise, has accepted many provisions of the Rome Treaty applicable to full members — provisions such as those relating to the movement of capital, labour, establishment, rules of competition and transport.

Association of Finland with the EFTA. Like the treaty of association of Greece with the EEC, the association agreement between Finland and the EFTA, signed in March 1961, also provides for resolving Finland's special problems and difficulties. Finland joins the European Free Trade Association, but in view of its special position is not a member. Most of the provisions of the Stockholm Convention relating to trade and economic matters would apply to Finland also. Finland will be extended the same concessions in the EFTA as the Seven receive. But some exceptions have been allowed. Finland is permitted to reduce its tariffs on some industrial goods at a slower rate than EFTA members, although a longer transition is not provided for. Since a substantial part of Finland's trade is regulated by bilateral agreements, it is permitted to maintain its existing quantitative restrictions on a limited number of goods, provided it applies those restrictions in such a manner that suppliers in the EFTA countries are given an opportunity of competing with other suppliers on fair and equal terms for a reasonable share of the Finnish market. Another important fact deserving mention is that at about the same time as Finland negotiated its association with the EFTA it concluded an agreement with the Soviet Union in March 1961 under which Finland has agreed to reduce tariffs on its main imports from the Soviet Union in the same proportion as it will reduce its tariffs on imports from the members of the EFTA. This position has been accepted by the EFTA members, because they recognize that the Soviet Union was an important trading partner of Finland and that Finland does not wish to jeopardize its commercial and economic relations with the Soviet Union by joining the EFTA. These special provisions indicate the flexibility of the association, based on a due recognition by the parties concerned of economic and political realities.

Latin America (ECLA Working group;) (*i*) *Tariff and other restrictions*—In the proposals for the regional market, the ECLA Working Group recommended that, over a period of ten years, each government should try to reduce its duties and restrictions in such a way that the average level of customs duties should not exceed a certain percentage in relation to the total value of each country's imports. It further recommended that each country could bring about a reduction in an average tariff either in relation to its imports as a whole or in relation to each category of imports (for example, capital goods, consumer goods, durable consumer goods, etc.) provided it achieved the agreed average level of reduction in relation to the total value of imports.[30] The object of this recommendation was to permit a country to reduce its protection on those items whose domestic production was small, while retaining protection on those items where local industries were meeting domestic requirements. Again, for the less developed countries, the Working Group recommended that the average level of duties permitted in the initial stages might be higher than for the others. For the purpose of implementing these principles, it suggested a classification of products into three categories, and also recommended the classification of the participating countries according to the degree of their development in the production of the three types of products. The scheme would thereby enable the less developed countries to maintain protection for a reasonable period.

(*ii*) *Principle of reciprocity*—The ECLA Working Group also emphasized the principle of reciprocity. This means that no country should receive greater advantages in a common market than any other country, commensurate with the concessions it has granted. Proceeding from this principle, the Working Group recommended that countries whose over-all balance of payments improved as a result of the reduction in duties and restrictions in the common market should accelerate the rate at which they lowered their duties and restrictions; correspondingly, those member countries which, as a result of the reduction in protection, experienced a balance of payments deficit or incurred a larger balance of payments deficit would be permitted temporarily to slow down the reduction of duties and restrictions.

The less developed countries would also be given facilities for the establishment of new export industries whose products could be marketed in the more developed countries of the common market. Financial and credit facilities for the establishment of such industries would also be provided.

The Montevideo Treaty. Like the ECLA Working Group, the Montevideo Treaty also stresses the need for member countries "to pool their efforts to achieve the progressive complementarity and integration of their national economies on the basis of an effective reciprocity of benefits" and to take appropriate measures in respect of the special situation of countries at a relatively less advanced state of economic development. Chapter VIII, article 32 of the Treaty provides for advantages not extended to others, in order to encourage new specific productive activities, more favourable conditions for the reduction of duties and restrictions, measures to correct an unfavourable balance of payments, non-discriminatory measures to protect the domestic output of products included in the liberalization programme which are of vital importance to a country's economic development, and collective arrangements for technical and financial assistance to promote new productive activities. Some of these measures may extend beyond the transitional period. With a view to promoting integration and complementarity, articles 14-17 of the Treaty provide for the closer co-ordination of industrialization policies, agreement on complementarity by industrial sectors, and measures to reconcile their export and import regimes with the above ends.

---

30 *The Latin American Common Market*, pp. 43-48.

(*e*) *Co-ordination of economic and financial policies*

It is recognized that in any integration movement among a group of countries, be it an economic union, customs union or free trade area, the economies of the constituent countries become increasingly interdependent, and that, therefore, some measure of co-ordination of their economic and financial policies is necessary. The extent to which a country participating in the common market will have to limit its independence of action for the purpose of co-ordination, the sectors in which it should do so, and the technical means, procedures and institutions by which the authorities of the common market union should exercise their functions of co-ordination—all these are fundamental policy issues to which attention is being given in Europe and Latin America in connexion with the formulation and implementation of integration schemes.

Different views are held on some of these questions. One view is that substantial divergences between countries in economic, financial and social policies will not permit the smooth functioning of a common market. For example, it can be argued that disparities in external commercial policy and balance of payments policy, disparities in the nature and level of taxation, differences in conditions of employment and wage structures, in social security services, etc., would distort competition and impede the optimum utilization of resources within the common market. On the other hand, it can also be argued that even if, on theoretical grounds, it is desirable to achieve a high degree of co-ordination and harmonization of economic conditions and policies, the formidable political and technical difficulties of achieving it within a framework and tradition of independent sovereign countries and of widely different political, social and economic institutions and policies should not be underestimated, and that co-ordination should be attempted on a pragmatic basis, taking cognizance of the above difficulties or else integration itself will not make much progress.

Broadly speaking, problems of co-ordination can be grouped in the following fields:

(*a*) Commercial policy, including tariffs, quantitative restrictions, subsidies, exchange controls affecting trade, state trading, monopolies, state aids, dumping, etc.

(*b*) Fiscal policy—particularly the application of income, production, consumption, turnover and other taxes and their effects on competition within the common market.

(*c*) Balance of payments policy, particularly ways and means of correcting balance of payments disequilibrium within the union and between the union and the outside world.

(*d*) Policy concerning freedom of movement of persons, services and capital.

In an economic union, problems of co-ordination in all the above fields will arise to a greater extent than in a customs union or free trade area. In a customs union, problems of co-ordinating commercial and financial policies will be more prevalent than in a free trade area. The co-ordination of commercial and financial policies by the authorities of the common market or free trade area will, in any event, inevitably affect the domestic economic and financial policies of member countries. Current discussions and decisions in Europe, as well as by ECLA indicate that these problems are being tackled in various *ad hoc* ways, on an empirical basis, with or without firm institutional arrangements. In several cases, only general provisions have been incorporated in treaties to deal with these problems. Even where specific procedures have been prescribed for particular types of situations, the exact means of solving them have not been specified. This is partly due to the desire to retain sufficient flexibility to deal with situations as and when they arise, but also due in some measure, as indicated above, to the differences in approach between member countries. But examination of these varied problems at the technical level by expert groups of the participating governments is contributing in the meantime to the growth of theoretical knowledge of the economics of integration.

The EEC, which ultimately aims at the establishment of an economic union of the Six, entailing common policies in various sectors, visualizes a great deal more of co-ordination than the EFTA, which only provides for free trade. The Montevideo Treaty also visualizes a considerable degree of co-ordination and harmonization of economic activities and policies, because it aims at economic integration in various sectors. As indicated in other sections, co-ordination of industrial and agricultural development and policies, special measures of assistance to under-developed countries, the negotiation of agreements in regard to industrialization and complementarity — all these would call for considerable co-ordination. The EFTA, on the other hand, includes provisions of only a somewhat general character. Article 30 of the Stockholm Convention states that member countries recognize that the economic and financial policies of each member state affect the economies of other member states, and therefore they should pursue them in a manner which serves to promote the objectives of the free trade association. They also undertake to exchange views periodically on all aspects of such policies, taking into account the corresponding activities in OEEC and other international organizations. The Council of the EFTA may also make recommendations to member states relating to economic and financial policies.

(*f*) *Commercial policy*

Commercial policy within a customs union or free trade area requires that practices distorting competition are prohibited, namely, quantitative restrictions, tariffs, state aids and subsidies, dumping, monopolistic practices, and any other administrative practices and procedures involving indirect protection to domestic industries of one country as against those of others. Both the Rome Treaty and the EFTA Convention include provisions to rule out the application of the above practices.[31] The Montevideo Treaty has also provisions to this end.[32]

---

31 *Rome Treaty:* Rules Governing Competition: Rules Applying to Enterprises, articles 85-90; Dumping Practices, article 91; Aids Granted by States, articles 92-94. *EFTA Convention:* Government Aids (article 13); Public Undertakings (article 14); Restrictive Business Practices (article 15); Dumping and Subsidized Imports (article 17).

32 *The Montevideo Treaty:* Articles 15,49 and 50.

The co-ordination of the external commercial policy of a customs union presents some significant differences from that of a free trade area. Under a customs union, the member countries have a common external tariff in relation to the rest of the world, and therefore a greater degree of co-ordination of commercial policy is required, whereas a free trade area, because it permits its member countries to have separate national tariffs with the outside world, does not call for the same high degree of co-ordination. This difference is reflected in the respective provisions of the Rome Treaty and the EFTA Convention.

The EEC calls for a common commercial policy,[33] and requires member countries to co-ordinate their commercial relations with third countries in such a way as to bring about the necessary conditions for implementing a common policy by the end of the transition period. During the transition, tariff negotiations and adjustments as well as measures for liberalizing quantitative restrictions taken by members of the Community in relation to third countries will be co-ordinated by the appropriate authorities of the Community (article 111). Measures taken by member countries to assist exports to third countries will also be progressively harmonized. The above measures are aimed at ensuring that the relations of a member country with third countries do not distort the conditions of competition within the Common Market and thereby defeat or impair the advantages conferred to one another. Procedures have been laid down for the exchange of information and for examination by the authorities of the Community of any measures taken by member countries.

After the transition period, the common external policy of the Community will be based on uniform practices in regard to tariffs, trade agreements, measures of liberalization, export policies, subsidies, dumping, etc. The EEC Commission will recommend necessary methods of co-operation to ensure that the commercial policy is not impaired by diversions of commercial traffic.

Commercial policy in the EFTA is covered broadly under article 30, already referred to. Under the Montevideo Treaty, the co-ordination of external commercial policy is covered by article 15(*a*), which requires member countries to "try to reconcile their import and export regimes as well as the treatment they accord to capital, goods and services from outside the area". The criteria for co-ordination are to be determined in due course.

The problems of origin and of deflections of trade represent a major aspect of commercial policy in a free trade area, and are dealt with in the next sub-section.

(*g*) *Origin of goods and deflection of trade*

Since, in a free trade area, the benefits of the removal of tariffs and restrictions on trade will be applicable only to goods originating in the constituent territories of the area, it is necessary to work out "origin" rules, to distinguish between the products of the member countries and those of third countries. The technical aspects of this problem have been examined in considerable detail in connexion with the negotiations to establish a European Free Trade Area and later by the EFTA itself in preparing its Convention and rules of "origin".[34]

Under the EFTA Convention (article 4), goods qualify for area benefits providing they come under the following rules:

(1) if they have been wholly produced within the territories of the member states;

(2) if they have been produced within the territories of the member states by certain processes as listed in annex B to the Convention ("the process rule"); or

(3) if not more than 50 per cent of their export price consists of materials imported from outside the territories of the member states (the "percentage rule").

Schedule I in annex B lists the goods and the processes in respect of which the importer will have a free choice in claiming benefits under the "process rule" or the "percentage rule". Schedule II lists the goods in respect of which the importer will not be able to use the "percentage rule" as an alternative. A wide range of primary products have been listed in Schedule III of annex B. These products, although they may be imported from outside the territories of the member states, are to be considered as if they had been produced within the territories of the member states. Thus, when an importer claims that goods are eligible for the benefits under the "percentage rule", he need not count any of the materials listed in Schedule III as being materials imported from outside territories. The western European countries are major importers of primary products, and have therefore included a large number of those items in the Basic Materials List.

The problem of deflection of trade is dealt with under article 5 of the EFTA Convention. The essential elements of the situation are that one member state (the importing country) has a higher external tariff on a certain raw material or intermediate product than another member state (the exporting member state); consequently, the exporting member state will have a price advantage in the importing member state's market, and as a result of the reduction and elimination of duties within the Association, imports of that manufactured article into the importing member state increase, causing serious injury to the industry producing that article in the importing member state. Under article 5, provision is made that a member country which proposes to vary its duties on imports from outside the free trade area should inform the Council so as to give the other member states an opportunity to make representations if they consider that the change will give rise to a deflection of trade. The member country which is considering a change of this kind is also obliged to

[33] *Rome Treaty:* Articles 110-116 deal with commercial policy.

[34] *The Report on the Possibility of Creating a Free Trade Area in Europe,* by a special OEEC Working Party (annex I: Problems of the origin of goods between the countries of a free trade area); *Negotiations for a European Free Trade Area* (cmnd 641), see section B: Problem of origin and deflections of trade, (pp. 104-190); *European Free Trade Association* (cmnd 906-1). Lists of qualifying processes and of basic materials; Forms of documentary evidence of origin.

have regard to the need for avoiding deflections of trade. If a member country believes that a deflection of trade of a particularly urgent nature occurs, it can refer the matter to the Council, which may authorize interim measures to safeguard its position. The Council will also keep under review the question of deflections of trade and their causes, and take such decisions as are necessary to deal with them. For this purpose, the Rules of Origin might also be amended. The above provisions thus embody a code of good conduct and various procedures for dealing with deflections of trade and safeguarding against them.

A question has been raised as to the adequacy of the above provisions. In this connexion, attention may be drawn to the differences between member countries which came to the fore during the unsuccessful negotiations for a wider European Free Trade Area during 1956-58.[35] The French representative on the OEEC Inter-Governmental Committee took the view that, if members of the Free Trade Area modified their customs tariffs in relation to the outside world without proper supervision or limitation, it would not only make the Rules of Origin ineffective, but also upset the balance between the reciprocal advantages which the member countries of the area had conferred to each other. The Free Trade Area should be founded upon reciprocal and lasting tariff advantages, similar to those which had been granted to each other by members of the EEC, and complete tariff freedom for the members of the Free Trade Area would be contrary to this conception. The United Kingdom, on the other hand, took the position that a code of good conduct and various procedures dealing with the origin and deflection of trade should provide all the safeguards in the field of origin. It also took the view that the objective of a free trade area consisted in the fact that its members mutually agreed to exchange free access to each other's markets and not a preferential position within those markets. It would be necessary, in practice, to co-ordinate the external trade policies of the free trade area countries, but this should not have the effect of restricting the liberty of member countries to modify their external tariffs—which was fundamental to the concept of a free trade area. It will be noted that the EFTA provisions are broadly in line with the views of the United Kingdom Government which are shared by other EFTA members.

In the Montevideo Treaty, the question of origin is covered by article 49 (*a*), which states that the criteria for determining the origin of goods and for classifying them as raw materials, semi-manufactured goods and finished products will be determined as soon as possible. A Commission has been set up to examine this matter.

The question of deflection of trade is dealt with in article 50, which contains the restriction that prior approval of the Association is necessary for the re-export of products imported by a member from the Area: this is aimed at preventing harmful deflections of trade. This will not apply to the re-export of products which are subjected in the importing country to industrial processing or manufacture, "the degree of which shall be determined by the Committee". The criteria for this have yet to be determined. It is expected that, in drawing up the criteria, special provisions will be made to facilitate the use of raw materials, normally imported from outside the area, in producing goods deemed to originate within the area.

(*h*) *Fiscal policy*[36]

Revenue from customs duties occupies an important place in the tax structure of almost all the countries of the ECAFE region. Consequently, the establishment of a common market by a group of countries would, by entailing the abolition of tariffs on trade among themselves, result in a loss of revenue, the extent of such loss being dependent upon the tariff rates applicable and the level of imports among themselves. Theoretically, a country faced with such loss of revenue in a common market could explore the alternative of levying countervailing domestic duties, but it should not apply to products of other member countries of the common market any charges or levies in excess of those applied to domestic products. Furthermore, establishment of the common market can by itself generate new sources of revenue: Thus, if economic activity, incomes and consumption rise as a result of the establishment of the common market, revenues from income and consumption taxes will go up, and possibly customs revenue from other imports. However, it is conceivable, as explained in the sub-section on "Special treatment of less developed countries and territories", that a common market can lead not only to an inequitable distribution of benefits of economic development, but also produce inequitable fiscal burdens. Such disparities and strains can be mitigated to some extent by the transfer of funds to the less developed territory or member through the machinery of public finance.[37]

Still another problem in fiscal policy faced in a common market arises from the possibility that differences in the nature and rates of various taxes on production and consumption within the same country and between various countries of a common market can distort conditions of competition and prevent the maximization of production or the optimization of trade.[38] The Rome Treaty, the EFTA Convention and the Montevideo Treaty contain provisions designed to ensure that internal charges and duties levied by a member state do not involve discrimination against similar products of other member states.

---

[35] *Summary report on the negotiations concerning the establishment of a Free Trade Area* [C (58) 257 dated 14 December 1958, prepared by the (OEEC) secretariat], paras 24-37.

[36] Some other aspects of fiscal policy — state aids, subsidies, etc. — have already been mentioned in the previous section on commercial policy. The over-all policy of inflation or deflation of member countries of a common market which is a major part of fiscal policy is considered in the next section dealing with balance of payments. In this section, reference is made to certain fiscal provisions in common market treaties.

[37] Thus, for example, in East Africa, the Economic and Fiscal Commission set up by the United Kingdom Government to review the existing financial and common market arrangements of the three territories, namely, Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda, recommended the creation of a distributable pool of revenue, to be constituted from specified sources. See *East Africa — Report of the Economic and Fiscal Commission*, February, 1961 (cmnd 1279).

[38] See J.E. Meade: *Problems of Economic Union*, pp. 22-26; R.F. Sannwald and J. Stohler: *Economic Integration;* Chapter V, Fiscal Policy.

Article 95 of the Rome Treaty requires that any member state will not impose, directly or indirectly, on the products of other member states any internal charges of any kind in excess of those applied directly or indirectly to similar domestic products. No member state should impose on the products of other member states any internal charges so as to afford indirect protection to other products. The EEC Commission will also consider and submit proposals for bringing about the harmonization of the laws in the various member states concerning turnover taxes, excise duties and other forms of indirect taxation (article 99).

Article 6 of the EFTA Convention rules out such protective charges, and member states undertake to eliminate any protective element in the internal taxes and charges levied by them; the EFTA Council will also be notified of all fiscal and revenue charges coming within the scope of this article.

Treatment in respect of internal taxation is dealt with in article 21 of the Montevideo Treaty, which requires that internal duties and charges will not be applied less favourably to products of other member states than to national products, and in article 22 which provides for appeal by an aggrieved party to the competent organs of the Association.

(*i*) *Balance of payments policy*

The problem of the adjustment of balance of payments in a common market is twofold, internal as well as external. In a common market, countries are theoretically not free to impose tariffs and quantitative restrictions as a means of restoring balance of payments equilibrium. Ruling these measures out, balance of payments equilibrium within a common market can be restored by three methods:[39] (1) provision of "accommodating finance" by the surplus to the deficit countries in the form of grants, loans, etc; (2) domestic inflations and deflations; and (3) variations of the rate of exchange.

The first method of assistance by the surplus to the deficit countries can take varied forms such as outright financial grants, central payments facilities (such as EPU), or temporary credits as extended by the International Monetary Fund or provided for under the European Monetary Agreement. The second method, namely, of domestic inflations and deflations, is analogous to the working of the gold standard under which a deficit country losing reserves will deflate its money incomes, prices and money costs and the surplus country will inflate its money incomes, prices and money costs until the dis-equilibrium is corrected. This mechanism would depend fundamentally upon domestic deflation in the deficit countries combined with domestic inflation in the surplus countries, and would call not only for the abandonment of the objectives of internal stabilization by national governments but also sufficient degree of flexibility of money costs and money wage rates. The stickiness of money costs and wages in a modern economy would make adjustment through this mechanism difficult and dislocating. However, within an economic union where freedom of movement of labour and capital is allowed, the shifts of labour and capital under competitive conditions might, to some extent, facilitate equilibrium.

The effectiveness of exchange rate adjustments in overcoming balance of payments difficulties would depend upon the elasticity of a country's demand for imports and of the foreign demand for its exports, in relation to the extent of adjustment needed. The advantage of this method is twofold: (*i*) the rate of exchange can be more easily altered than the rate of money wages, and (*ii*) variation of the exchange rate is consistent with the maintenance of policies for maintaining full domestic employment. But variable exchange rates have their disadvantages in that frequent changes will introduce uncertainty in international transactions and undermine the stability of the currency, and they can also be abused for competitive currency depreciation and beggar-my-neighbour policies.

The external adjustment of the balance of payments of a customs union can also be achieved by internal deflations and inflations of member countries, variations in their rates of exchange *inter se* or with those of third countries, joint programmes of restrictions by members of the union on payments to countries outside the union, or external assistance to the union member by outside sources. There are, however, two methods of giving effect to domestic inflations or deflations and applying restrictions on payments to third countries, namely, the national method and the economic union method.[40] The national method would emphasize the separate obligations of the members of the customs union in their national economic policies, while the economic union method would stress the common policies of the union as a whole. Under the first, each country undertakes to inflate or deflate internally according as its over-all balance of payments is in surplus or deficit. Under the second, member countries would agree to co-ordinate their independent domestic financial policies in the interests of preserving domestic equilibrium inside the union as a whole, and to use their joint programme of controls over external payments to third countries in such a way as to maintain the balance of payments of the union as a whole in equilibrium.

Under the Rome Treaty. It is interesting to note that the provisions of the Rome Treaty relating to balance of payments permit the flexible use of all the means described above. The national method is indicated in article 104, which specifies that each member state will pursue the economic policy necessary to ensure the equilibrium of its over-all balance of payments and to maintain confidence in its currency, while ensuring a high level of employment and stability of the level of prices. To achieve this, there will be the necessary co-ordination of the economic policies of the member states. Co-ordination does not mean uniform measures, but appropriate measures for the different countries according to the special circumstances and problems of each. The EEC Commission will submit recommendations and the Monetary Committee

[39] See J.E. Meade: *Problems of Economic Union*, chapter II, "Balance of Payments".

[40] Also J.E. Meade: *The Theory of Customs Unions*, chapter I, and Appendix I: "Rules of the Game of the Balance of Payments of an Economic Union", pp 116-119.

will keep under review the monetary and financial situation in each country and the union as a whole (article 105) (economic union method). Under article 107, each member state will treat its exchange rate policy as a matter of common interest. A member state may alter its rate of exchange, but if it is considered incompatible with the conditions of competition within the common market, the Monetary Committee may authorize other members to take specified measures to deal with the situation. The Commission will review the measures taken by a member country to correct its balance of payments and recommend measures to it for adoption. This includes domestic financial and monetary measures.

The granting of mutual assistance is provided for in article 108. Such assistance may take the form of (*i*) limited credits by other member states; (*ii*) "concerted action in regard to any other international organizations to which member states may have recourse"—this would mean IMF, GATT or any other association of states having common economic objectives, e.g. EFTA or sterling area; or (*iii*) "any measures necessary to avoid diversions of commercial traffic where the State in difficulties maintains or re-establishes quantitative restrictions with regard to third countries".

In addition to the above means of assistance, special reductions in customs duties or increase of quotas by other member states are permitted during the transition period, in order to improve the exports of the member state in distress. On the whole, the Rome Treaty permits a member of the common market to take adequate measures on a national basis to protect its balance of payments subject to the condition that such measures do not hinder the functioning of the Common Market and are subject to review and revision by the appropriate authorities of the EEC.

EFTA. The EFTA provision is rather more general (article 19), but it goes much further in one respect than the Rome Treaty in permitting quantitative restrictions on imports, in order to safeguard the balance of payments. (Theoretically, this method of remedial action is ruled out among member states in both a customs union and a free trade area). The EFTA authorities should, if possible, be notified in advance of such measures, and may make "recommendations designed to moderate any damaging effect of these restrictions or to assist the member state to overcome its difficulties". If the balance of payments difficulties persist for more than 18 months, and the measures applied disturb the operation of the Association, the Council might "devise special procedures to attenuate or compensate for the effect of such measures". The EFTA members have indicated their inability to spell out these general provisions in more detail at this stage in response to the specific request of GATT Contracting Parties.[41]

The EFTA Convention also embodies provisions for permitting remedial action to correct difficulties in special sectors (article 20). If a member country experiences an appreciable decrease in the internal demand for the product of a domestic industry and if this decrease is due to an increase in imports from other member states as a result of the freeing of trade, it may impose quantitative restrictions on imports from other member states, subject to certain conditions. It might take other measures as well (including reintroduction of tariffs), with the majority vote of the Council. The Council may also authorize a different time-table for the reduction of protective duties in a member country, provided their total elimination by the end of the transition period is not affected thereby.

The Montevideo Treaty. The Saving Clauses of the Treaty (articles 23-26) permit a member country to impose quantitative restrictions to correct balance of payments deficits and to overcome difficulties in special sectors of the economy. But such measures shall normally be limited to a period of one year.

(*j*) *Policy concerning free movement of labour, establishments and capital*

This paper does not deal with the theoretical aspects of this subject—namely, whether free movement of the factors of production is necessary for the most efficient utilization of resources within a common market, the circumstances under which owing to the equalization of factor prices such movement of production factors will be unnecessary, the reasons why free trade in commodities alone might not bring about the most efficient use of resources, and the differences in the system of distribution of income and property, in monetary and fiscal policies and quantitative controls, and in demographic trends between countries which would render inefficient and impractical the desired degree of free movement of the factors of production.[42] This subsection is confined to a brief account of the actual provisions contained in the Rome Treaty, EFTA Convention and the Montevideo Treaty regarding mobility of production factors, and to an explanation of the differences in the degree of integration envisaged thereunder.

The Rome Treaty goes far in this field. One of the bases of the community is the abolition, as between member states, of the obstacles to the free movement of persons, services and capital. Four chapters of the Treaty (articles 48-73) deal with this subject. Policies of member states regarding capital movements with third countries will also be harmonized. In addition, articles 100-102 concerning "Approximation of laws" specify the conditions for bringing about the approximation of such legislative and administrative provisions of member states as have a direct incidence on the establishment and functioning of the common market, particularly when a disparity between the legislative or administrative provisions of the member states distorts the conditions of competition in the common market.

The social provisions of the Treaty (articles 117-128) aim at promoting occupational and geographical mobility of workers and increased opportunities of

---

[41] GATT: *EFTA: Replies from the Member States to the questions submitted by the Contracting Parties* (L/1167) pp 30-32.

[42] For a discussion of these questions see J.E. Meade: *Problems of Economic Union* — Chapter 3, "Movements of labour and capital, and also R.E. Sannwald and J. Stohler: *Economic Integration:* Theoretical Assumptions and Consequences of European Integration — Chapter 6: "Factor Mobility".

employment, including re-training and re-settlement, for which purpose the European Social Fund has been established. Articles 119 and 120 provide for the harmonization of social conditions as follows:[43] Equal pay for male and female workers, maintenance of equivalence of paid holiday schemes, and inclusion of provisions regarding payment of overtime, which are of special interest to France. The European Investment Bank has been established to provide financial facilities for modernizing or converting enterprises or creating new activities which are called for by the progressive establishment of the common market.

[43] The soundness of the above provisions concerning the principle of equal pay for equal work has been questioned on theoretical grounds. "Some have held that the common market should have a common wage structure. No doubt this is a point on which vested interests will make much clamour, inveighing against low wages somewhere else. This appears to be a sphere in which economists should make a helpful contribution by expounding the doctrine of comparative costs. It is most unlikely that, for equilibrium, wages ought to be equal even in the major European countries. If existing differences are greater (or possibly less) than those required for equilibrium, this can be subsumed under the .... problem of exchange rates." *The Free Trade Proposals,* Oxford — "Common market in perspective" by Sir R.F. Harrod. pp. 52-53. See also in the same publication R.F. Kahn, "A Positive Contribution", pp. 62-63.

The EFTA has only limited commitments in this field. Provision is made for the elimination of restrictions on the establishment and operation of economic enterprises by nationals of one country in the territories of other countries, thereby providing conditions of competition necessary for the functioning of the free trade area. In regard to invisible transactions and transfers, the Convention recognizes their importance but considers that the obligations accepted by members in this regard in other international organizations are sufficient for the present. If any further provisions are considered necessary, decisions will be taken later.

The Montevideo Treaty does not contain any specific provisions for promoting freedom of capital, enterprise or labour within the free trade area apart from most-favoured-nation treatment, but envisages harmonization of the conditions of treatment given by member countries to capital, goods and services from outside the area (article 15).

III. STRUCTURE OF INTRAREGIONAL TRADE OF ECAFE COUNTRIES

Introduction

In examining the possibilities for greater co-operation in the field of trade among the countries of the ECAFE region, it is essential to study the present pattern and possible future trends of intraregional trade of the ECAFE countries. Such a study should include, among other things, an analysis of future prospects for expansion of intraregional trade with particular reference to developmental planning, trade policies, principal commodities, payments problems and measures for promoting intraregional trade in the context of expanding world trade. This paper does not represent such a study, which in itself is a major undertaking, but merely attempts to give a general picture of the structure of intraregional trade, its significance in relation to trade of the ECAFE countries with the rest of the world and in comparison with intraregional trade of other areas where integration schemes are under way. This study also includes a brief analysis of certain principal commodities of the ECAFE region, existing preferential arrangements and Japan's role in intraregional trade.

It should be noted at the outset that the present pattern of intraregional trade of the ECAFE countries is the result of a number of historical and economic factors, including political ties, monetary connexions, and the amount of foreign investment from certain countries outside the region. For this reason, the structure and magnitude of the intraregional trade of ECAFE countries differ from those of Latin America and western Europe. However, its future pattern need not necessarily continue to be the same, but would depend to a large extent upon the degree of co-operation among ECAFE countries and political and economic policies pursued by them.

Considering the limited range of commodities produced by most countries in the region, the limited complementarity within their economies, the geographical extent of the area, and the lack of necessary facilities for greater flows of trade, the intraregional trade of the ECAFE countries still occupies a very important part in their total trade. Intraregional trade of nineteen[44] ECAFE countries in 1957-1959 accounted for about one-third of their total trade, both in the case of exports and imports. By contrast, the corresponding figures for the central American countries and the entire Latin American countries are only 3 per cent and 9 per cent respectively. However, for western Europe, intraregional trade accounted for about 54 per cent of total trade. The ECAFE region therefore occupies an intermediate position in this respect.

Table 1

Percentages of Intraregional Trade to Total Trade, 1957-1959 Average

ECAFE countries	33.7
exports	34.0
imports	33.3
LATIN AMERICAN countries (exports and imports)	8.9
Central American countries (exports and imports)	3.2[a]
WESTERN EUROPEAN countries (exports and imports)	53.7

[a] Average of 1952-1954.

[44] For the purpose of this study, total ECAFE intraregional trade includes trade of Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, China: Taiwan, Federation of Malaya, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Republic of Korea, Laos, North Borneo and Sarawak, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Republic of Viet-Nam, with all countries in the region including China: Mainland. Trade between the Federation of Malaya and Singapore is not included. Trade of Afghanistan, Brunei and Nepal is not included because of the lack of data.

Share in ECAFE intraregional trade

Japan, Indonesia and Singapore accounted for one-half of the total intraregional exports of the ECAFE countries in 1957-1959. Japan headed the list by contributing 28.4 per cent of the total. These three Territories, together with five others, namely, Burma, Hong Kong, India, Iran and Thailand, accounted for 81 per cent of the total intraregional exports of the ECAFE countries. Eleven other ECAFE countries accounted for only 19 per cent of the total.

A similar pattern may be seen from the import side. Three territories, i.e. Hong Kong, Japan and Singapore, accounted for about one-half of the total intraregional imports of the ECAFE countries in 1957-1959. Japan again was the largest contributor, responsible for 19.6 per cent. It was followed closely by Singapore which accounted for 17.6 per cent. It may be noted that the distribution of the shares of intraregional imports among the ECAFE countries was less concentrated than in the case of exports; the top eight countries in the region accounted for 78 per cent of the total intraregional imports, as against 81 per cent in the case of exports.

Table 2

Percentage Share in Intraregional Trade of ECAFE Countries, 1957-1959 average

Country	*Exports*	*Imports*
Burma	4.4	3.1
Cambodia	0.7	1.0
Ceylon	1.3	4.3
China: Taiwan	3.7	2.5
Federation of Malaya	3.6	4.4
Hong Kong	7.9	12.3
India	6.9	8.8
Indonesia	11.5	5.9
Iran	4.8	2.2
Japan	28.4	19.6
Korea, southern	0.4	0.8
Laos	0.2	0.5
Pakistan	2.6	2.4
Philippines	3.3	3.9
Sarawak	3.0	3.3
Singapore	10.6	17.6
Thailand	6.2	5.2
Viet-Nam, southern	0.5	2.2
Total	100.0	100.0

It may seem that, apart from trade with entrepôt ports and with Japan, there has not been very much trade between the ECAFE countries. The role of Japan in intraregional trade is dealt with in a later section of this paper. As to the entrepôt trade, although up-to-date statistics are not available to substantiate the point, it has been recognized that a substantial proportion of ECAFE imports from the entrepôt ports consist of goods originating within the region, and likewise a good proportion of ECAFE exports to these ports is re-exported to other ECAFE countries. The entrepôt ports, owing to their geographical location, facilities and traditional role in trade, should thus be considered as having facilitated trade between countries in the region no less than with countries outside the region. Moreover, the existence and growth of processing and manufacturing industries in these ports, such as tin smelting and rubber processing in Singapore and cotton textiles and a variety of other industries in Hong Kong, have made the intraregional exports and imports of these two ports with other ECAFE countries more than merely entrepôt trade. Therefore, the large share of the entrepôt ports in intraregional trade should by no means be discounted as disguised trade with countries outside the region.

It is interesting to note that more than half of Hong Kong's exports were domestic products (average 1958-1959) and only 43.5 per cent were re-exports of foreign goods (table 3). It should be further noted that over three-fourths of Hong Kong's re-exports, which consisted mainly of manufactured goods, went to ECAFE countries. This is in contrast to its exports of domestic products, which also consisted of manufactured goods, but most of which went to countries outside the region.

Table 3.

Hong Kong: Composition and Direction of Exports

(per cent)

	1958	*1959*	*1958-1959 average*
Total exports	100	100	100
Domestic exports	42.2	69.6	56.5
To ECAFE countries	9.5	18.8	14.3
To Western Europe	13.9	17.1	15.6
To United States	6.9	17.2	12.3
To others	11.9	16.5	14.3
Re-exports	57.8	30.4	43.5
To ECAFE countries	41.7	24.0	32.5
To Western Europe	5.0	2.3	3.6
To United States	4.0	0.8	2.3
To others	7.1	3.3	5.1

Importance of intraregional trade to individual countries

The importance of intraregional trade varies widely from one ECAFE country to another, depending upon the nature of the economy, the composition of exports and imports, geographical location and special commercial and monetary connexions. Table 4 shows that food exporting countries have a high proportion of intraregional exports, while food deficit countries, with the exception of India and Japan, depend upon imports from countries in the region to a very large extent. Indonesia, Laos, North Borneo, and Sarawak,

owing to their geographical location, show a high degree of dependence upon intraregional trade, both in imports and exports. The entrepôt trade of the Federation of Malaya, Hong Kong and Singapore contribute greatly to the high level of intraregional trade of these countries.

For some countries in the region, the importance of intraregional trade is quite low in the case of imports and high in the case of exports; for example southern Korea, whose high proportion of intraregional exports is due to the fact that its total exports consist mainly of raw materials and foodstuffs, while its imports are largely from the United States, with which it has special financial connexions. In the case of Ceylon, on the other hand, the importance of its intraregional imports is far greater than that of exports, mainly because tea and rubber, Ceylon's main export products, find their markets outside the region. On the other hand, Ceylon's heavy dependence on intraregional imports is due to its position as a food deficit country and to its imports of manufactured goods from India. Japan is another country whose proportion of imports from the region is lower than that of its exports to the region. Nevertheless Japan, being the leading industrial country in the region, is responsible for the high level of intraregional exports of many ECAFE countries.

It may be noted that western Europe and the United States are major trading areas for the countries of the ECAFE region. Western European countries are a major source of supply of the region's requirements, particularly machinery and engineering products. Trade with western Europe is especially important for those ECAFE countries which have traditional commercial and monetary connexions with that area. The United States is also a very important supplier as well as buyer of ECAFE products. United States exports have been assisted by the large volume of financial assistance which it extends to the region. It will be noted that the Philippines, which has preferential trading arrangements with the United States, conducts a major proportion of its trade with that country.

For the ECAFE region as a whole, trade with the outside world is decidedly more important than that within the region. Table 4 below shows that trade of ECAFE countries in 1957-1959 with the two major trading areas namely, western Europe and the United States, together constituted a little less than one-half, while intraregional trade was one-third of their total trade. In comparing imports with exports, it will be seen that the proportion of intraregional exports was slightly higher than that of imports, that is 34 per cent for the former as against 33.3 per cent for the latter. In contrast, the proportion of ECAFE countries' imports from western Europe and the United States (together, 48 per cent) was moderately larger than that of exports to these areas, which was 43 per cent.

Table 4.

ECAFE Countries: Direction of Trade, Average 1957-1959

(Per cent of total exports or imports of the country concerned)

Country	*ECAFE intra-regional*		*Western Europe*		*U. S. A.*	
	Exports	*Imports*	*Exports*	*Imports*	*Exports*	*Imports*
Burma	73.7	50.5	11.9	34.6	1.0	4.2
Cambodia	37.7	52.3	22.9	35.4	23.5	7.5
Ceylon	13.4	44.2	40.2	32.9	8.9	5.1
China: Taiwan	78.0	43.2	4.3	9.2	6.2	37.7
Federation of Malaya	25.3	49.6	40.7	39.4	17.1	2.2
Hong Kong	48.3	54.3	16.8	23.2	11.8	9.6
India	17.9	17.6	37.3	45.5	17.4	18.9
Indonesia	43.9	39.1	30.4	34.0	16.2	16.3
Iran	19.2	20.9[a]	32.3	47.6[a]	3.0	17.0[a]
Japan	33.2	22.1	11.0	9.2	25.6	34.8
Korea, southern	71.3	13.7	13.8	8.1	15.8	78.6
Laos	63.9	52.4	29.2	34.2	...	12.6
North Borneo	63.4	54.9	24.3	28.0	2.8	8.0
Pakistan	27.4	23.8	47.2	39.5	10.8	26.2
Philippines	23.1	26.6	18.8	14.8	54.1	47.9
Sarawak	60.6	86.1	15.6	9.9	5.1	1.1
Singapore	40.4	65.7	27.1	20.6	9.5	4.0
Thailand	60.7	48.8	10.9	31.1	21.0	16.9
Viet-Nam, southern	23.3	32.7	55.4	40.1	10.9	24.0
ECAFE region	34.0	33.3	24.5	24.0	18.6	24.0

[a] Average 1957-1958.

Commodities in intraregional trade

The export value of twelve principal commodities listed in table 5 below represented 55 per cent of the total value of the ECAFE region's exports to the world as a whole, and 48.2 per cent of the total value of intraregional exports in 1957-1959. It should be noted that the commodity which ranked first in intraregional exports during the period was not a primary product but a manufactured one, namely, textiles. The ECAFE region's exports of textiles increased in volume and importance, outranking natural rubber which had earlier headed the list. Textiles also became the largest contributor to intraregional export trade. Countries exporting textiles included Japan, India, Hong Kong, China: Taiwan, Pakistan and the Philippines, in order of magnitude.

Natural rubber ranked second in total value of ECAFE exports to the world as a whole, but its importance in intraregional trade was less than that of rice and petroleum and petroleum products. Eighty per cent of the natural rubber went to industrial countries outside the region; the only buyers in the ECAFE region were Japan, mainland China, India and Hong Kong. Exports of machinery and transport equipment from Japan and India were the third most important export item, and Japan accounted for virtually the entire amount; however, only a quarter of the total exports went to ECAFE countries. Petroleum was exported by Indonesia, Iran, North Borneo and Sarawak, which shipped a major part to countries outside the region. The only importers of crude petroleum in the region were China: Taiwan, India, Indonesia, Japan and the Philippines, while buyers of petroleum products included most ECAFE countries which also obtained a substantial quantity of their requirements from sources outside the region.

Although food products have lost ground to the expanding exports of manufactured goods and industrial raw materials in terms of total value of exports to the world as a whole, rice still occupied the second place in intraregional exports in 1957-1959. Its dependence on markets within the region was the greatest of all the main primary export commodities of the region. This is in contrast to tea, which had a higher export value than rice, but only a fraction of tea exports went to ECAFE countries.

It should also be noted that the ECAFE region as a whole had in early prewar years been a net importer of rice, but, owing to increased production, especially among the rice importing countries, the region had a rice surplus and became a net exporter in 1957-1959. Nevertheless, some countries in the region still obtained part of their requirements from outside the region.

The ECAFE region as a whole was a net exporter of sugar. However, nearly half of its sugar exports went to countries outside the region. Owing to a special agreement, most of the sugar from the Philippines is exported to the United States. Although other sugar exporters, namely, China: Taiwan, India and Indonesia,

Table 5

ECAFE exports of certain principal commodities to the world and to other ECAFE countries

(average 1957-1959)

Commodity	Total exports of ECAFE countries		Intraregional exports		Approximate value of intraregional exports as percentage of total exports
	Approximate value (million US$)	*Percentage of total ECAFE exports*	*Approximate value (million US$)*	*Percentage of total intraregional exports*	
Textile[a]	1,280.3	12.6	409.2	11.9	32.0
Natural rubber	1,129.1	11.1	230.9	6.7	20.4
Machinery and transport equipment	770.2	7.6	203.9	5.9	26.5
Petroleum and petroleum products[b]	647.5	6.4	244.9	7.1	37.8
Tea	535.1	5.3	25.5	0.7	4.8
Rice	365.3	3.6	277.5	8.1	76.6
Copra[c]	264.8	2.6	73.4	2.1	27.7
Sugar	215.3	2.1	93.7	2.7	43.5
Tin concentrates	158.5	1.6	21.4	0.6	13.4
Raw cotton	123.7	1.2	60.9	1.8	49.0
Coconut oil[c]	59.2	0.6	10.3	0.3	17.2
Pepper	34.1	0.3	8.6	0.2	25.4
Others	4,542.8	44.9	1,782.2	51.8	34.3
Total	10,125.9	100	3,442.4	100	34.0

[a] Average 1957-58. Figures do not include jute products.

[b] The figures do not include the shipment of crude petroleum from Brunei to Sarawak for processing. Data on exports of petroleum and petroleum products for 1958-59 are taken as equal to 1957 figures.

[c] Average 1957-58.

shipped a major portion of their sugar to countries of the region, many ECAFE countries, especially Japan, still imported a large quantity of sugar from outside the region.

The proportion of intraregional exports of raw cotton to total raw cotton exports was the second highest after rice. The majority of raw cotton exported from Pakistan, India, Burma and Cambodia was purchased by Japan, Hong Kong and mainland China while most of Iran's exports went to Europe. Raw cotton was another primary product in which the region had a net deficit; about 80 per cent of the region's import requirements were met by shipments from the United States and Latin American countries during 1957-1959.

The bulk of tin concentrates was exported to industrial countries outside the region; Japan was virtually the only tin importer in the region. A fair proportion of copra, exported from Ceylon, Federation of Malaya, Indonesia and the Philippines went to ECAFE countries, which included India, Japan and Singapore. Only 17.2 per cent of the coconut oil exported from Singapore and other copra producing countries was shipped to ECAFE countries, which included mainland China, Burma, Hong Kong and India, while the rest went to countries outside the region.

Existing preferential arrangements

The countries of the ECAFE region at present participate in preferential arrangements either within the region or outside. The application of these preferential arrangements may be broadly classified into three categories: the employment of discriminatory rates of tariffs, quantitative restrictions and bilateral agreements.

Tariffs. Countries of the region which are members of the Commonwealth participate in Commonwealth tariff preferences. This involves preference to Commonwealth countries outside the region as well as to those within the region. Thus, intraregional tariff preference is applied to the following countries: Brunei, Ceylon, Federation of Malaya, Hongkong, India, Pakistan, North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore. Burma which ceased to be a member of the Commonwealth on attaining independence, abolished Commonwealth tariff preference in 1954.

Cambodia and the Republic of Viet-Nam have two tariff rates—general and minimum. The latter tariff rate applies to trade with all those countries with which they have entered into an agreement for that purpose. A number of countries (including several countries of the ECAFE region) enjoy the minimum tariff treatment. The preference, such as it is, is not solely regional.

Japan's tariff has two rates—general and conventional, the latter rate applying to imports from countries with which Japan has GATT relations or agreements with a most-favoured-nation clause in respect of customs duty. Japan may also apply a "beneficial rate" of duty equivalent to the conventional rate to imports from countries other than those entitled under the aforementioned conditions, by issuing cabinet orders.

Quantitative restrictions. Quantitative restrictions applied by the countries of the region either on grounds of balance of payments or of trade have some preferential effect. Thus the sterling countries of the region, on balance of payments grounds, applied a preference in favour of soft currency imports and discrimination against hard currency imports. Since the end of 1958, however, as a result of the external convertibility of sterling (and other western European currencies) this element of preference or discrimination has been virtually eliminated in most of these countries.

Japan has entered into special agreements with a few countries outside the region by which it allows imports of certain non-essential goods (such as television sets, whisky, confectionery, dried raisins and certain textiles) which are otherwise prohibited, by giving special allocations of foreign exchange.

The quotas in the Philippines-United States trade agreement for certain commodity imports and exports are examples of preferential quantitative trade restrictions.

Several countries of the region apply quantitative import restrictions with a view to giving priority of foreign exchange allocation to development requirements (including capital goods and industrial raw materials) and eliminating non-essential imports. This preference is exercised on economic, and not on regional or geographical grounds, but since the bulk of such development imports is obtained from extra-regional sources, and only a small proportion from within the region, it has the effect of preference in favour of extra-regional as against regional imports.

Bilateral agreements. A certain degree of preference is involved where countries of the region have entered into bilateral long-term commodity contracts, and credit arrangements which may or may not be linked to specific economic development projects. The rice contracts of Burma imply that a certain measure of preference is accorded to their fulfilment by the rice importing countries, especially if there is a binding obligation to take specific quantities of rice. The rice contracts of Thailand with other countries sometimes gave special price concessions to the purchasers through a reduction in the rates of the rice export tax.

All bilateral contracts, especially of a barter character, involve mutual preference to the exclusion of other parties. These, however, are not a significant factor in the region's trade. On the other hand, the "tied" loan, aid and credit arrangements which are important in trade, especially with advanced countries outside the region, involve bilateral trade and preference in favour of trading partners extending similar financial facilities as against others. However, strictly speaking,

it would not be correct to describe these devices as deliberately preferential, although they inevitably involve some degree of preference.

The existence of state trading in some countries in the region has also provided opportunities of extending preferential treatment to other countries. This may be done as a matter of course and without the need for formal negotiation or agreement, but the preferences extended by state trading enterprises are not usually of a long-term nature.

To sum up, it can be stated that, for the most part, existing preferential arrangements favour trade with countries outside the region and have not been made specifically on a regional basis.

Place of Japan in intraregional trade

Japan, as the leading industrial country in the region, occupies a place of special importance in intraregional trade. The value of Japan's exports to and imports from ECAFE countries accounted for 28 per cent and 20 per cent respectively of total intraregional exports and imports in 1957-1959 (table 2). It sent about one-third of its total exports to ECAFE countries and obtained 22 per cent of its total imports from the region. During this period, ECAFE countries were the largest buyers from Japan, but the United States was the largest supplier of Japan's import requirements (see table 4).

It is important to note that Japan's imports of food and raw materials, except fuels, accounted for 60 per cent of its total imports in 1957-1959, while machinery, transport equipment and other manufactured goods accounted for only 15 to 19 per cent of its total imports. However, the share of imports from ECAFE countries was only about one-quarter of Japan's food imports and less than one-third of its imports of raw materials, except fuels. Table 6 shows that rice was the only principal food item in which the ECAFE region had a major share in Japan's imports, but Japan's dependence on rice imports has been declining in recent years. About 80 per cent of its maize imports came from Africa and the United States. Japan obtained a large proportion of its sugar requirements from Latin American countries and Australia.

Although ECAFE countries supplied to Japan a wide variety of raw materials, both agricultural and mineral, the region had a major or substantial share in Japan's imports only in a few of these products. These include rubber, tin metal, timber, copra, jute and other hard fibres, iron ore, manganese ore and concentrate, copper ore and concentrate and bauxite. Japan obtained the bulk of its imports of raw cotton, wool, salt, hides and skins, soyabeans, mineral fuels, animal and vegetable fats and oils and chemicals from outside the region.

It is likely that over a period of years, substantial increase in the supply of a number of goods to Japan can be achieved by the ECAFE countries. However, this would call for a number of measures to increase production, to improve quality and to make prices competitive with those of suppliers outside the region. In many cases, increased production of agricultural and mineral products would call for the careful preparation and execution of development projects which might require the co-operation of industrially advanced countries.

The large demand for Japanese goods by the ECAFE countries related mainly to a wide variety of manufactured goods. Textiles were the largest single item purchased by the ECAFE countries, followed by machinery and transport equipment, iron and steel products and chemicals (mainly fertilizers). Over 80 per cent of Japan's cement exports and the bulk of its rolling stock exports went to ECAFE countries. Even minor items exported by Japan, such as food, which consisted mainly of canned fish, raw materials and mineral fuels, found a fair proportion of their markets within the region (see table 7).

Table 6.

Share of ECAFE Countries in Japan's Imports of Certain Principal Commodities, Average 1957-1959

(In million US$)

	Total	ECAFE countries	Share of ECAFE countries (per cent of total)
Food	524	137	26.1
Wheat	159	0	0
Sugar	129	54	41.9
Rice	53	46	86.8
Maize	43	9	20.9
Others	140	28	20.0
Raw materials, excluding fuels	1,681	537	31.9
Raw cotton	367	53	14.4
Wool	218	1	0.5
Iron ore	158	122	77.2
Iron and steel scraps	184	28	15.2
Soyabeans	93	11	11.8
Timber	101	82	81.2
Natural rubber	81	81	100.0
Jute and other hard fibres	26	22	84.6
Salt	20	8	40.0
Hides and skins	32	4	12.5
Copper ore and concentrates	33	17	51.5
Tin metal	17	16	94.1
Manganese ore and concentrates	9	8	88.9
Copra	10	8	80.0
Bauxite	7.9	6.6	83.5
Mineral fuels	582	107	18.4
Coals	120	19	15.8
Petroleum products	116	22	19.0
Crude petroleum	346	67	19.4
Animal and vegetable oils and fats	35	5	14.3
Chemicals	190	6	3.2
Machinery	327	1	0.3

However, it should be noted that Japan's exports of manufactured goods to certain ECAFE countries had been accelerated during this period by its reparations payments to these countries. Reparations payable would amount to US$200 million to Burma in ten years beginning October 1955, US$550 million to the Philippines in twenty years from July 1956, US$223 million to Indonesia in twelve years from April 1958, and US$39 million to the Republic of Viet-Nam in five years from January 1960. These payments are being made in terms of manufactured goods consisting of industrial and transport equipment, textiles, fertilizers and machinery. Such payments will continue to contribute to a sizable volume of exports from Japan to the ECAFE region for some time to come.

Table 7.

SHARE OF ECAFE COUNTRIES IN JAPAN'S EXPORTS BY PRINCIPAL COMMODITY GROUPS, AVERAGE 1957-1959

(In million US$)

	Total	*ECAFE countries*	*Share of ECAFE countries (per cent of total)*
Textiles	979	329	33.6
Machinery and transport equipment	766	201	26.2
Vessels	348	24	6.9
Rolling stocks	24	20	83.3
Automobiles	38	20	52.6
Iron and steel products	237	142	59.9
Chemicals	144	109	75.7
Pottery	53	8	15.1
Cement	29	25	86.2
Food	221	40	18.1
Animal and vegetable oils and fats	31	5	16.1
Raw materials, excluding fuels	92	21	22.8
Mineral fuels	10	5	50.0

ANNEX

STEPS TOWARDS ECONOMIC INTEGRATION IN LATIN AMERICA

This section attempts to describe steps taken by the Latin American countries toward the establishment of regional markets. The idea of economic integration in Latin America was seriously advocated as early as in 1949, when the ECLA secretariat, in the *Economic Survey of Latin America 1949* (United Nations Sales No. 1951 II E.1), pointed out the urgent need for progressive forms of economic integration among these countries. As a result, the central American countries, where the need for economic integration is particularly strong owing to the limited size of the internal markets and resources of each country, were the first to take further constructive measures, which are described in section II of this annex.

Meanwhile, the plan for economic integration for Latin America as a whole was envisaged, and further studies on the subject were made by the ECLA secretariat. Steps towards the establishment of a common market for Latin America as a whole are described in section I of this annex. Section III deals with steps leading to the conclusion of the Montevideo Treaty, which may be considered as an intermediate stage in the creation of the common market for Latin America as a whole.

I. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMON MARKET FOR LATIN AMERICA AS A WHOLE

After the publication of the *Economic Survey of Latin America 1949,* in which the need for progressive forms of economic integration in Latin America was stressed, the ECLA secretariat made further studies on the subject, including one entitled "Study on Inter-Latin American Trade" (1956 II 6.3), which became a basis for subsequent work. The real impetus for the establishment of a common market for Latin America as a whole came from the Trade Committee which was created by resolution 101 (VI) of the sixth session of ECLA (September 1955), for the specific purpose of "intensifying inter-Latin American trade", and "to that end, the Committee was requested to prepare specific proposals". The Trade Committee has since become the central body for the development of a common market for Latin American countries as a whole.

Before convening the first session of the Trade Committee, the secretariat set up a group of three experts who, in May and June 1956, visited the seven Latin American countries which accounted for the largest proportion of intraregional trade. The group contacted foreign trade and central bank authorities, as well as members of government and private organizations connected with trade and production. Their findings were set forth in several documents, which were sent out to the member governments well in advance of the meeting. These documents include "Payments and Trade in Latin America—Current Proposals" (E/CN. 12/C. 1/3) and "Inter-Latin American Commodity Trade in 1954 and 1955—Situation and Prospects in 1956" (E/CN. 12/C. 1/5). In addition, ECLA experts prepared a report entitled "Payments and Regional Market in Inter-Latin American Trade" (E/CN. 12/C. 1/4), containing the analyses and recommendations regarding a regional market. This report, reasserting the urgent need for progressive forms of economic integration, was also presented by the secretariat for consideration, first to member governments and later to the Trade Committee.

The first session of the Trade Committee met at Santiago in November 1956, and was attended by all members of the Commission. The Commission set up two sub-committees,—one, to examine problems relating to payments and agreements and the other, to study problems connected with products and a regional market.

At this meeting, all delegations were convinced that a Latin American common market would facilitate their

accelerated economic development, and that bilateral trade which accounted for about 80 per cent of total Latin American trade should be transformed into liberalized multilateral trade.

The following resolutions were passed by the Committee:

(*a*) A resolution to set up a working group to study the "possibilities of gradually establishing a multilateral payments regime and to suggest the measures best calculated to achieve that end";

(*b*) A resolution to make preliminary studies for the creation of a regional market. The secretariat was to make an inventory of existing industries in Latin America with a view to determining what measures were advisable in order to remedy conditions not conducive to the creation of a regional market;

(*c*) A resolution to establish procedures for the creation of a regional market:

(*i*) the secretariat was to set up another group of experts to define the characteristics of the regional market and examine the possibility of its establishment;

(*ii*) the secretariat was to transmit reports of the group of experts, together with observations received from other international organizations, to member governments for consideration and comment;

(*iii*) the secretariat was to submit a final report to the second session of the Trade Committee after receiving comments from member governments.

(*d*) A resolution recommending member governments the adoption of a policy for the gradual liberalization of intraregional trade in raw materials and foodstuffs.

The secretariat then prepared a report entitled "Bases for the Formation of the Latin American Regional Market", describing briefly the structure of the proposed common market and defining basic principles and procedures leading to the establishment of a common market. The report was compiled for the first meeting of the Working Group convened in Santiago in February 1958. The Working Group was composed of the President of the National Council of Economy of Brazil, the Director-General of the Bank of Mexico, a professor of the University of Chile, the President of the Buenos Aires Stock Exchange, a former Minister of Finance of Peru, a former President of Equador and a former Minister of Development of Colombia. The group adopted the report and transmitted it, together with suggestions and recommendations, to member governments of ECLA.

On the more definite bases agreed upon by the first Working Group, the secretariat proceeded with the preparation of a report entitled "Possible Alternatives for the Establishment of the Latin American Regional Market" (E/CN. 12/C. 1/WG 2/7), which was examined by the second Working Group that met in Mexico City from 16 to 27 February 1959. The report dealt with the possible structure of the common market, its objectives, its juridical form, the customs and liberalization regime to be instituted, the classification of products, the programme for the first stage, the regime for relatively less developed countries, the size of the market and initial groupings, specific complementarity and specialization agreements, treaties on trade or economic matters not covered by the agreement, most-favoured-nation treatment and a proposed committee on trade policy and payments, composed of representatives of all the member countries, to engage in further negotiations. The group made a series of comments and recommendations for submission to the Trade Committee.

In addition to the two meetings of the Working Group, the secretariat convened four *ad hoc* meetings of consultants in trade policy in August 1958 and April 1959 at Santiago, in November 1958 at Bogota, and in May 1959 at Caracas. The meetings were attended by experts acting in their private capacity from various Latin American countries. Their purpose was to ascertain the views of the consultants on some important trade questions and to seek solutions. The Santiago meetings resulted in the adoption of the draft agreement establishing a free trade area for southern countries (see section III).

II. CENTRAL AMERICAN INTEGRATION

At the fourth session of ECLA in June 1951, five Central American countries, namely, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua, introduced a resolution requesting the secretariat to study the means or plans for the progressive attainment of the integration of the economies of the Central American countries. A committee called "The Central American Economic Co-operation Committee", consisting of Ministers of Economic Affairs or persons appointed by them was set up to (*a*) act as a co-ordinating body, (*b*) serve as a consultative organ of the Executive Secretary of ECLA, and (*c*) direct the studies and examine the conclusion therein. During the same session of ECLA, another resolution was adopted for the establishment of an ECLA branch office in Mexico City for the purpose of undertaking studies of economic problems of Central American countries.

After the Central American Economic Co-operation Committee had been set up, the ECLA secretariat prepared certain preliminary studies, including "Economic Integration and Reciprocity in Central America" (E/CN. 12/AC. 17/3), "Economic Integration and Technological Co-operation" (E/CN. 12/AC. 17/4), "Standardization of Customs Tariff Nomenclature" (E/CN. 12/AC. 17/5), and "Transport in Central America" (E/CN. 12/AC. 17/6). These reports served as a basis for discussion of the Committee during its first session held at Tegucigalpa (Honduras) in August 1952.

At this session, it was decided to undertake a programme for the gradual and progressive integration of the Central American economies on the basis of co-operation and reciprocity among the five governments.

The integration would be concentrated, in its early stages, in the specific sectors of crop and livestock production and industry.

More studies were undertaken by the secretariat on various aspects of the Central American economy, such as transport, energy, technological research, pulp and paper, livestock and dairy industries and the textile industry. Work was also started on the preparation of the uniform Central American Customs Nomenclature, customs regulations and the establishment of a school of public administration for Central America. Assistance was provided by the United Nations Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Inter-American Statistical Institute.

In January 1956, the Central American Economic Co-operation Committee, at its third session, examined the secretariat's report evaluating the integration programme as set forth by the first session of the Committee, and resolved to concentrate its work on certain specific industrial aspects and on the establishment of a free trade zone. An *ad hoc* committee to draw up a draft multilateral treaty on inter-Central American free trade and economic integration was set up. Another *ad hoc* committee was assigned to outline a system of integrated industries.

During 1957 and the early part of 1958, the draft Multilateral Treaty on Free Trade and Central American Economic Integration was completed by the *ad hoc* committee and presented for consideration to the Central American Governments and, thereafter, to two consultative meetings of the representatives of the Central American Ministers of Economic Affairs. At these meetings, various amendments and additions were proposed to the text and to the schedule of free trade commodities. In September 1957, the Central American Trade Sub-Committee approved a method of computing import duties for purposes of comparison. It also discussed procedures for equalizing import charges and agreed that the equalization should be made through a common tariff.

During the same period, a draft agreement on a regime for Central American Integration Industries prepared by another *ad hoc* committee was presented for consideration to the Central American Economic Co-operation Committee. The committee modified the draft and recommended that the Central American Governments give it careful study and consideration, with a view to its early signature.

During the fifth session of the Central American Economic Co-operation Committee held at Tegucigalpa in January 1958, two agreements were signed: (*a*) Multilateral Treaty on Free Trade and Central American Economic Integration, and (b) Agreement on the Regime for Central American Integration Industries, by plenipotentiaries of the Governments of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica. It was stated in the treaty that the free trade area was a step toward the creation of a customs union between the five signatory states. No provision was made for other states to accede to the agreements.

On 1 September 1959, at San José (Costa Rica), the Central American Agreement on the Equalization of Import Duties and Charges was signed by plenipotentiary representatives of the five Central American Governments. According to this agreement, the Contracting States would grant one another a preferential tariff reduction of 20 per cent on imports of certain primary and manufactured goods produced within their territories.

Assurances were given at the thirtieth session of the Commission that the Central American integration scheme was compatible with Latin American integration as a whole, and the five Central American countries would, when the right time came, accede as a bloc to a common market embracing the whole region.

III. THE MONTEVIDEO TREATY

While many consultants and expert working groups were actively engaged in helping the ECLA secretariat in the work laid down by resolution 101 (VI) under the direction of the Trade Committee, four southern countries, namely, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay, considered entering into a multilateral agreement as a temporary solution to solve their pressing customs and exchange problems. The secretariat intervened by arranging two *ad hoc* expert meetings at its headquarters in August/September 1958 and April 1959. At the second meeting, it was decided that, instead of entering into a multilateral agreement, the four southern countries would establish a free trade area. A draft agreement for consideration by the respective governments, and with a view to its submission in due course to the Contracting Parties of GATT, was adopted by the meeting. The opinion was expressed that the proposed free trade zone was a step toward the creation of a common market. The experts also felt that all Latin American countries desirous of participating in the free trade area should be free to do so, and that the signatory countries should not enjoy more privileges than countries subsequently joining the system.

The Trade Committee, at its second session convened at Panama City from 11-19 May 1959, discussed the proposed free trade area. Some delegates expressed the fear that such sub-regional groupings might impede the process of establishing a Latin American common market. However, an assurance was given that the plan for the free trade area was of a provisional nature, and would disappear once the establishment of the common market had been negotiated on the basis of the principles formulated at the Mexico City meeting. The Committee considered and decided on the basic principles for the scope and operation of the proposed common market, and recommended that the governments of the Latin American countries set up working groups to co-ordinate all national activities related to the proposed common market. The Committee also requested the secretariat to set up a group of high ranking experts to be nominated by member governments. The group was to meet not later than February 1960 to prepare a preliminary draft agreement on the Latin American common market.

The eighth session of the Commission, which met at Panama City from 14-23 March 1959, took note of the Trade Committee's report, and requested the secretariat to give the highest priority to the work assigned to it by the Committee.

The secretariat sent observers to an information meeting on the proposed free trade area held at Lima from 16-18 July 1959 at the invitation of the Government of Peru. The purpose of this meeting was to give the four countries which had originally prepared a draft agreement on the free trade area (Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay) an opportunity to explain all the various aspects of the draft to Bolivia, Paraguay and Peru.

The first Inter-Governmental Conference for the Establishment of a Free Trade Area among Latin American countries was held at Montevideo from 16-30 September 1959, and was attended by delegations from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay. Representatives of Mexico and Venezuela were present as observers. The ECLA conference presented amendments to the draft treaty for the establishment of a free trade area, and prepared several draft supplementary protocols. The secretariat participated in the preparatory work and its representatives attended the conference as observers.

The second Inter-Governmental Conference for the Establishment of a Free Trade Area among Latin American countries was held at Montevideo from 4-18 February 1960. This Conference culminated in the conclusion of the Montevideo Treaty signed by representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay. The participation of Mexico, the northernmost country of Latin America, helped to dissipate the fear that the plan would be exclusive sub-regional grouping and might impede the process of establishing the common market for the whole of Latin America.

CRITERIA FOR ALLOCATING INVESTMENT RESOURCES AMONG VARIOUS FIELDS OF DEVELOPMENT IN UNDERDEVELOPED ECONOMIES[45]

(A BIBLIOGRAPHY AND INTRODUCTORY NOTE)

I. INTRODUCTORY NOTE

It is generally recognized that the same rate of investment may have widely different effects in advancing the development of an economy, depending on how or where that investment is applied. Hence the importance of investment criteria, especially in under-developed economies which are short of capital and urgently need rapid economic growth. In view of the structural disequilibria inherent in under-developed economies, however, those investment criteria (e.g. profit maximization) which can be properly applied in developed countries do not necessarily satisfy the needs of under-developed countries.

Economists have put forward a number of criteria and techniques for allocating investment resources to different sectors or projects in planning the development of under-developed economies. Although many of these criteria and techniques differ in their approach to the problem, some are closely connected. The differences in approach usually reflect different evaluations as regards the objectives of economic development, and this suggests a basis for determining the order in which the criteria may conveniently be studied.

The most general objective of economic development is to maximize the national income or the rate of economic growth. Accordingly, the criteria which are most appropriate for allocating the available investment resources in the pursuit of this objective will be considered together in this note, as a first group. Included are the capital-output ratio or rate of capital turnover, cost and benefit analysis, social product analysis, and the rate of savings and reinvestment.

In the formulation of a development plan, attention may have to be given also to one or both of two specific objectives namely, to maximize employment and to minimize balance of payments problems. The criteria that are appropriate to assessing resource allocation in relation to these objectives differ in emphasis from those already mentioned, and will be treated in separate groups. The method of assessing benefits and costs by means of "accounting prices" rather than market prices may be used in applying criteria relating to different objectives. It will therefore be convenient to describe this method in a separate section.

The criteria so far included are primarily concerned with the efficiency of investment, in relation to one or other of the objectives mentioned. A further matter that must receive attention in the formulation of a development plan is the mutual consistency of investments. As aids in assessing the investment allocation from this point of view, several tools or techniques of inter-industry analysis have been devised, including the standard unit requirement method and input-output analysis. These will be reserved for treatment in the final section of this note.

A comprehensive balanced economic development plan will no doubt include projects which differ in the emphasis of their contribution to the development process. Some may be intended primarily to promote some aspect of income maximization and a rapid rate of growth or of capital accumulation; others may be aimed primarily at employment absorption, or derive their importance from balance of payments effect. It follows that in the formulation of a development plan it may be desirable and necessary to apply several of the investment criteria and techniques, each of which, as already noted, has its own particular uses with consequent strong and possibly some weak points. In the end, however, and indeed in the beginning, an element of judgement in investment allocations is by no means ruled out.

As a step towards the more efficient and more rational allocation of investment resources, it seems essential to attempt to calculate, for the particular economy, concrete values for the various concepts (e.g. capital-output ratio, capital-labour ratio, output-labour ratio, etc.), in order to permit the wider use of the technical tools involved in the application of the investment criteria. When there are gaps in the available statistical data, it may be worth-while to make informed guesses at certain points, to enable the criteria to be applied tentatively while more precise data are being accumulated and prepared.

By way of an introduction to the annotated bibliography that follows, the main features of the various criteria and techniques, including their usefulness and weaknesses and the relationships among them, will be briefly described, in the order indicated above. (For a general discussion of various criteria, see Nos. 33, 34, 37 and 52).[46]

[45] This paper was originally prepared by the ECAFE/FAO Agriculture Division and the Research and Planning Division of ECAFE in response to a specific request from one ECAFE member country. In view of wider interest in the subject, copies were mimeographed in 1959 and distributed to government planning agencies, central banks, universities and economic research institutions in all countries of the ECAFE region. For publication in this *Bulletin* the bibliography has been considerably strengthened, mainly by adding reference to literature published in 1959 and 1960. Corresponding additions have been made in the introductory note. Some references to papers which are no longer available have been deleted.

[46] Hereinafter, numbers in the brackets indicate the numerical order of books and articles contained in *An Annotated Bibliography on Investment Criteria,* Part II of this paper, pp. 34-44.

Income Maximization

Capital-Output Ratio

The incremental capital-output ratio (or capital coefficient) seeks to represent the amount of additional investment required to produce an additional unit of output. The ratio is usually based on an analysis of past experience where possible, but may allow for anticipated changes in the future period. The over-all capital-output ratio can be used as a tool for estimating capital requirements for the whole economy, while capital-output ratios for individual sectors, industries or processes may be used to estimate capital requirements sector by sector or project by project (Nos. 1, 21, 31 and 60).

This concept assumes a stable relationship between capital and output, which is more likely to be the case in the over-all economy. However, the sectoral capital-output ratios may vary widely with the stage of economic development, the pattern of investment, the relative importance of non-capital inputs, and the amount of investment in complementary sectors.

The capital-output ratio when applied as a priority criterion is synonymous with the capital-turnover criterion suggested by J. J. Polak (No. 41) and N. S. Buchanan (No. 2). It is maintained that, to maximize income, choice should be made of investment projects with a low capital-output ratio, i.e. a high rate of capital turnover. However, this criterion has some serious limitations. Firstly, the time element plays a key role, since quick maturing projects with a lower capital-output ratio in the short run do not necessarily have a lower ratio in the long-run. Secondly, the supplementary benefits of an investment project to other economic activities are neglected. In view of project complementarity, in fact, a project with a higher capital-output ratio should not necessarily be accorded a lower priority (Nos. 33 and 34). Thirdly, when applying this concept to agriculture in under-developed countries, it should be noted that the magnitude of fixed capital investment may be quite small in proportion to total inputs e.g. of working capital such as fertilizer, so that the fixed capital output ratio may vary rather widely due to factors other than capital investment (No. 60).

Cost and Benefit Appraisal

The techniques of "benefit-cost analysis" have been developed in the United States in order to provide a basis for assessing the economic soundness and the optimum scale of river basin development projects. (For the description of this technique, see Nos. 36, 58, 61 and 63-66—for its theoretical basis No. 61). A project is economically justified when total assessed benefits exceed total assessed costs, i.e. when the benefit-cost ratio is above unity; and the optimum scale is obtained by finding a point where the excess of benefits over costs is at the maximum—at that point the ratio of increments of benefits to increments of costs becomes unity.

The applicability of the benefit-cost analysis to projects other than those for river basin development (especially agricultural projects such as land reclamation, irrigation and drainage, farm mechanization and soil fertilization) was discussed at the third session of the ECAFE Working Party on Economic Development and Planning (No. 59). It is agreed that the benefit-cost ratio can be used as a criterion for investment priorities only as between projects of comparable types. In the case of projects which have many non-economic implications or the benefits of which are too scattered in time and space, however, it may not be possible to use the benefit-cost analysis as a priority criterion (No. 61).

In the application of this method, various difficulties arise, especially in the measurement of benefits. One of them is to estimate future price levels. In addition, there is considerable controversy concerning the nature, extent and measurement of secondary benefits, i.e. the net values added over and above the value of the immediate products or services of the projects, as a result of activities stemming from or induced by the project. There seems to be a recent trend in developed countries to base economic appraisal on primary effects only. However, in under-developed countries, where there is a greater likelihood that an investment project will stimulate a number of economic and social activities, secondary benefits might well occupy a significant place in project appraisal. If secondary benefits are fully taken into account, the cost and benefit method will amount to a kind of the social product criterion which is described below.

Social Product Criterion

Two main proposals for applying this criterion have been advanced. One is the *national product (or consumption) test* suggested by J. Tinbergen (No. 31). This is based on an assessment of the project's direct, indirect and secondary consequences, all values of which are reckoned at "accounting prices" as referred to later. "Indirect consequences are those to be expected in the absence of further changes in total national income", while "secondary consequences consist of the changes in production which are the consequence of the change in national income, both in the short and the longer run, connected with the new production".

The other proposal is the *social marginal productivity (SMP)* criterion which was first advanced by A. E. Kahn (No. 20). H. B. Chenery (No. 4) attempts to quantify the SMP principle by applying it to a number of empirical situations in several countries. In allocating investment resources, one should take into account "the total net contribution of the marginal unit to national product, and not merely that portion of the contribution (or of its costs) which may accrue to the private investor". The efficient allocation is the one which maximizes the value of national product, and the rule for achieving this is to allocate resources in such a way that the social marginal productivity of capital is approximately equal in the different uses.

As a rule, the SMP is not correlated with the rate of capital turn-over referred to earlier. The results obtained from the two criteria will diverge, especially widely in the case of projects which create greater external economies.[47] As a practical rule of thumb,

[47] Any "economy" which is brought about by a particular projects, other than a change in its own direct net product, can be regarded as an "external" economy generated by the operation of that project. For a discussion of external economies, see Nos. 15, 24 and 51.

nevertheless, Kahn admits that the capital-turnover criterion is useful where capital is relatively scarce and labour extremely plentiful, except that some investments which clearly relate to a bottleneck in development may be capital-intensive. In case the social opportunity cost of labour is very close to zero, the SMP criterion will in fact approximate the capital-turnover criterion. Chenery also considers that the rate of capital turnover is "particularly useful in choosing among projects within a given sector".

The SMP criterion is expressed in terms of once-for-all effect on the national income, and does not include the specific multiplier effect of investment on future income levels. In other words, it does not take account of what happens to the final products—this determines in part the investment rate in future which in turn determines the level of future incomes. Nor does it take account of changes in the nature and quality of the factors of production such as population and labour force that may, in part, be an indirect consequence of the current investment allocation.

Maximizing the Rate of Saving and Capital Accumulation

From the criticisms mentioned above of the SMP criterion comes the argument by W. Galenson and H. Leibenstein (Nos. 16 and 21) that the appropriate goal of development should be the maximization of per capita output, or average income, at some future point in time, rather than the maximization of national income now. Hence, the correct criterion for investment must be to maximize the rate of savings and thus of reinvestment, and to "choose for each unit of investment that alternative that will give each worker greater productive power than any other alternative". It is assumed that profits are largely saved for reinvestment and that wages are largely spent. The best allocation of investment resources is to be achieved, it is claimed, by distributing the available capital among the various alternative uses in such a way that "the marginal per capita reinvestment quotient" of capital is approximately equal in the various uses. Apart from human factors such as the quality of the labour force, it is the capital-labour ratio (or capital intensity) that determines output per capita. As a corollary, the reinvestment criterion favours capital-intensive projects even where capital is scarce. M. Dobb (Nos. 8 and 9) also emphasizes the maximization of the rate of saving and capital accumulation, and advocates the allocation of a high proportion of investment to capital-goods industries.

However O. Eckstein (No. 12) considers that it might be desirable to employ fiscal means to attain an income distribution which will yield sufficient savings, rather than to depend on planned investment based on the reinvestment criterion. Furthermore, "endless growth for its own sake does not make too much sense", or there may be circumstances in which the current consumption may be a more immediate concern. Consequently, at a later stage of development or even in the present in some instances, the reinvestment criterion may have to be tempered by the consideration of the value of current consumption to the community (Nos. 12 and 21).

Employment Absorption

It is often argued that, since under-developed economies are generally characterized by massive under-employment along with scarcity of capital, one should select those investment projects that substitute abundant labour for scarce capital or, in other words, mobilize the maximum amount of labour per unit of investment. The maximization of employment may also be a social and political objective. The employment absorption criterion has a family relationship with the case for low capital intensity, i.e. low capital-labour ratio.

The maximum labour absorption, however, does not necessarily lead to the maximization of the addition to total output. Adherence to capital-saving and labour-intensive investments may result in perpetuation of low labour productivity. Moreover, a course of maximizing the rate of investment may do more within the not so distant future to provide work for the underemployed than the capital-saving and labour-intensive use of the existing investment potential can do in the immediate future. The choice between capital-intensive or labour-intensive forms of investment "depends, not on the existing ratio of available labour to capital (treated as a stock), but on precisely the same considerations as those which determine the choice between a high or low rate of investment (or rate of increase in the existing stock of capital goods)" (No. 8).

A variant of the employment absorption argument is found in a doctrine advanced by R. Nurkse (No. 24). He draws attention to the potential savings concealed in rural underemployment and proposes to mobilize the underemployed for capital formation. This proposal implies that the output of the formerly excess labour when productively employed less minimum maintenance costs of that labour, can be used entirely for the production of capital goods. This involves essentially a plan for forced savings out of the labour of the previously disguised unemployed. Although admitting that there may be circumstances under which it would be best to put into effect Nurkse's proposal, Leibenstein suspects that "there is no evidence to lead us to believe that the particular technique suggested by Nurkse is the best way of obtaining the forced savings, or that the amount so obtained is the optimum amount" (No. 21).

Balance of Payments Effect

Since foreign exchange, a factor which is vital to the development of an under-developed economy, is usually scarce in under-developed countries, the balance of payments effect assumes importance as a criterion for the allocation of investment resources and the determination of priorities. It is often advocated that priority should be given to those projects which minimize balance of payments deficit or, in other words, increase the supply of foreign exchange or economize the use of it.

The balance of payments effect has two different aspects, namely the effects during the investment phase which are always negative, and the operating effects. J. J. Polak (No. 41) classifies investments into three types according to whether the operating effect is positive, neutral, or negative. Type I includes exports

and substitutes for imports, Type II replacements for goods at present consumed, and Type III goods sold in the home market in excess of the demand resulting from increase in real incomes. He maintains that the amount of investments in Type I sectors must be sufficiently large for the resulting positive balance of payments effects to offset the negative effects of investments of Type III and of the investment phase of all types of projects. However, this is not a very operational approach, because the output of many commodities may fall into several categories. Moreover, it does not tell what changes should be made in the programme in case the criterion is not satisfied.

In quantifying the SMP principle, H. B. Chenery (No. 4) incorporates the balance of payments effect. He suggests that a premium should be attached to foreign exchange earning or saving. This premium mathematically "represents the amount of increase in national income which would be equivalent to an improvement of one unit in the balance of payments under specified conditions". It generally "measures the average over-valuation of the national currency at existing rates of exchange, taking into account the expected effect on imports and exports of the whole investment programme and also the balance-of-payments position at the beginning of the period".

The difficult foreign exchange situation currently prevailing might result in overemphasis on balance of payments effect in investment allocations. This criterion, therefore, needs to be balanced by the consideration of comparative advantages in the long run (No. 33).

Accounting Prices

Whatever the criteria for resource allocation, difficulties arise in the measurement of present and future benefits from a given project and of the costs that are incurred in obtaining such benefits. Market prices, particularly those of the factors of production, form a very imperfect guide to resource allocation in under-developed economies, because there exist fundamental disequilibria which are reflected in the existence of massive underemployment at present levels of wages, the deficiency of funds at prevailing interest rates and the shortage of foreign exchange at current rates of exchange. The equilibrium level of wage rates will be considerably lower than market wages, while equilibrium interest rates will probably be much higher than market rates.

If a criterion is to be based on the concept of social product, it will be essential to remedy this defect. To do this, the use of "accounting prices" or "shadow prices" which truly reflect intrinsic values of factors of production is suggested by J. Tinbergen (No. 31) and by H. B. Chenery and K. S. Kretschmer (No. 5).

In the application of this theory, however, a certain arbitrariness may enter into the assessment of these intrinsic values. Shifts in accounting prices which may arise from the realization of investment programmes are difficult to predict. Moreover, the application of accounting prices might result in favouring, more than long-term considerations would warrant, those projects which are labour-intensive, which create or save foreign exchange and which promise a quick yield on the capital employed (Nos. 34 and 52).

The concept of accounting prices has to be made precise before it can be applied in the actual preparation of economic plans. A recent attempt at greater precision defines accounting prices as "the values of the marginal productivity of factors when a selection of techniques has been made which produces the maximum possible volume of output, given the availability of resources, the pattern of final demand and the technological possibilities of production" (No. 25). It would then be for the government to calculate marginal productivities of factors and manipulate the system of subsidy and taxation in such a way that the supply prices of factors to the producers became equal to the value of their marginal productivity. However, even apart from the difficulties in calculating the marginal productivity of the factors, the problem of producers' response to changes in taxes and subsidies would also have to be studied.

Inter-Industry Analysis

The rational allocation of investment resources requires the mutual consistency of investment programmes and the various production and import targets. Inter-sectoral and inter-industrial resource flow should be co-ordinated in such a way as to minimize bottlenecks in production due to an imbalance in the supply of manpower, raw materials, semi-finished goods, power, transport, etc. On the other hand, it is also necessary to ensure, in order to maximize output, that there are no redundant inventories or capacities (No. 33).

Standard Unit Requirements

The method of resources budgeting and commodity balances is a rudimentary way of establishing relationships between particular inputs and outputs for each project or industry separately. One particular tool for this purpose is the method of standard unit requirements, i.e. input requirements per unit of output under the standard conditions. However, the extension of the coverage of this method will logically lead to input-output analysis (No. 34).

Input-Output Analysis

Input-output analysis consists in determining the direct and indirect input requirements of the various industries per unit of final demand. The requirements may be expressed in quantitative terms e.g. units of raw material, or in categories of final costs, e.g. for labour, capital, imports, etc. By use of the various technological coefficients relating to the employment of such factors as capital and labour that are obtained from the input-output table, it is possible to assess the resource requirements for a given bill of goods. Comparing the resulting resource requirements for each sector, it is possible to plan for the allocation of additional units of resources sector by sector, in relation to projections of demand (Nos. 5, 6, 33 and 34).

Use of technical coefficients based on past data for projecting future demand for intermediate goods implies an absence of technological change, absence of

substitution of one unit for another, and constant returns irrespective of the scale of operation. However, the development of under-developed economies implies technical progress and probably also the substitution of domestic products for imports of certain intermediate goods. In short, economic development generally aims at changing the very technical coefficients which are the basis of input-output tables. A further limitation of input-output technique for underdeveloped countries arises from the relatively smaller importance of commercial relations between domestic industries, resulting from the existence of a large export sector, from the high degree of dependence for many consumption goods on imports, and from the existence of a large subsistence sector outside the market mechanism (Nos. 33 and 34).

Attempts have been made to test the empirical validity of the assumption of constant input coefficients in industrialized countries through (*a*) direct comparison of individual input-output ratios at different points of time and (*b*) comparison of an input-output projection with the actual operation of the economy. "Overall tests, in conjunction with direct study of input coefficients, indicate that in certain parts of the economic structure, modifications of strict intput-output assumptions are clearly desirable". One such modification which would be found useful in planning in underdeveloped countries, would be the insertion of alternative inter-industry columns of input coefficients to be estimated directly from basic engineering production functions, or from the engineering designs of new plants or from a weighted combination of different input coefficients for different techniques (No. 6).

Inter-industry tables make it possible to study the interdependence of the various sectors of the economy, which has to be kept in mind in allocating investment resources. The increasing availability of detailed input-output data for various countries makes it possible to compare the structure of production in different countries, pointing to the likely existence of a common pattern in the relations among the different sectors. A measure of the indirect way in which each sector is connected to others is provided by the extent to which it purchases inputs from other sectors, and alternatively the extent to which it sells its output for further use in production. Such a comparative analysis has been made for the United States, Japan, Norway and Italy. (No. 6). Also inter-industry tables lend themselves to a study of the role of individual industries in the national economy.

Inter-industry projections can be undertaken to examine the implications of expansion targets for the industrial sector or for specific industries. In development programming, the feasibility of overall projections and of the investment programmes around which the projections are based, can also be tested with their help. Given the projections of final demand in as great a detail as possible, and the corresponding matrix of technical coefficients, it is possible to estimate the corresponding expansion of outputs and their factor requirements, which can be checked against the available supplies. By trial and error the expansion of production of domestic substitutes for imports can also be arrived at. Such an analysis can also be used as a basis for detailed projections of investment requirements by sector and by type of capital goods. (Many such illustrative examples are discussed in No. 6).

II. AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON INVESTMENT CRITERIA FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERDEVELOPED ECONOMIES[48]

A. General

1. Abbas, S. A., *Capital Requirements for the Development of South and South East Asia.* Groningen, 1956, pp. v, 151.

   A chapter on the economic structure of South and Southeast Asia is followed by some theoretical and statistical analysis of capital coefficients and capital requirements. Some estimates are made of the capital requirements for this region with certain targets of development in view.

2. Buchanan, N. S., *International Investment and Domestic Welfare.* Some Aspects of International Borrowing and Lending in the Post-War Period. New York, 1946, pp. xvi, 249.

   Among the topics considered are the economic aspects of planned industrialization, and the relation between foreign borrowing, domestic investment, and balance of payments problems. The author maintains that "If investment funds are limited, the wise policy, in the absence of special considerations, would be to undertake first those investments having a high value of annual product relative to the investment necessary to bring them into existence".

3. Chakravarty S., *The Logic of Investment Planning,* Amsterdam 1959, pp. ix, 170.

   This study is mostly concerned with the problems of intersectoral distribution of investment analyzed with the help of a dynamic Leontief model. It is assumed that capital is the only factor with an infinite life span and the structure of relative prices remains constant. For "analytical" purposes the amounts of investment are taken as given and the consequent increase in output at some specified period or periods in future is arrived at: for policy purposes the distribution of investment to achieve future output targets is studied. Attempt is made to extend the scope of the existing growth models to include the "maturity lags" in investment and to indicate their effect in slowing down the rate of growth in income. The dynamic analysis, as developed in this study, also tries to take into account the 'structural breaks' in a growing economy: distribution of investment has to be studied among not only existing producing

[48] Part of the bibliography is derived from A. Hazelwood, *The Economics of Under-Developed Areas:—Annotated Reading List of Books, Articles and Official Publications,* London, 1959.

sectors but also the new sectors which are likely to emerge during the development process. The paths of development are studied on the assumptions of (*a*) an unchanged economic structure and (*b*) a 'structural break' of a specified nature, and are then compared from the point of view of a utility index. The study is prefaced with a useful expository analysis of the growth models of Harrod, Domar, Mahalanobis, Leontief and von Neumann set in an input-output framework.

4. Chenery, H. B., "The Application of Investment Criteria", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Feb. 1953 pp. 76-96.

   The main purpose of this paper is "to bridge the gap between theory and practice" and "to seek a workable method of formulating and testing investment programmes in underdeveloped areas". "The basic tool used is an approximation to the social marginal productivity which can be applied to individual comparisons among investment projects". Data are drawn from Greece, Turkey, Portugal and southern Italy.

5. Chenery, H. B., and Kretschmer, K. S., "Resources Allocation for Economic Development", *Econometrica*, Oct. 1956, pp. 365-99.

   "The primary purpose of this study is to develop a model based on linear programming and input-output techniques which will assist in the formulation of development programmes for underdeveloped areas". See also H. B. Chenery, "The Role of Industrialization in Development Programs", *American Economic Review*, May 1955 (Paper and Proceedings Supp.), pp. 40-57, an article based on the same study.

6. Chenery, H. B., and Clark P. G.; *Inter-industry Economics*, New York 1959, pp. 345.

   A comprehensive account is given of the basic input-output theory. The empirical basis for inter-industry models and tests of the validity of the input-output assumptions involved are discussed. The application of inter-industry techniques is illustrated, with particular reference to problems of economic development.

7. Deekshit, G. R., Patil, R. K. and Datye, K. R., "Capital Formation and Choice of Techniques in Underdeveloped Economies", *Indian Economic Journal*, July 1956, pp. 43-60.

   It is argued "that in an underdeveloped country, for a given volume of employment labour-intensive techniques and combinations of labour and capital intensive techniques will give a larger volume of producers' and consumers' goods in comparison to capital intensive technique".

8. Dobb, M., *On Economic Theory and Socialism*. Collected papers. London 1955, pp. viii, 293.

   i. "A Note on the So-Called Degree of Capital-Intensity of Investment in Under-Developed Countries". Reproduced from Economie Appliquée (Institut de Science Economique Appliquée, Paris), 1954, No. 3.

   The traditional principle that, in an underdeveloped economy where capital is scarce relatively to labour, capital investment needs to take the form of projects of low capital intensity, has much less generality than it is usually assumed to have. The choice between more or less capital intensive form "depends, not on the existing ratio of available labour to capital . . . , but on precisely the same considerations as those which determine the choice between a high and a low rate of investment . . .". See also an article by the same author (No. 9), and by H. G. Johnson, "Note on Economic Development and the Maximum Rate of Growth", *Malayan Economic Review*, April 1957, pp. 16-22.

   ii. "A Note on the Discussion of the Problem of Choice between Alternative Investment Projects", Reprinted from *Soviet Studies*, Vol. II, No. 3, Jan. 1951.

   Comments on the proposals presented in an article by S. G. Strumilin (No. 30).

9. Dobb, M., "Second Thoughts on Capital-Intensity of Investment", *Review of Economic Studies*, 1956-57, Vol. XXIV, No. 63, pp. 33-42.

   A further elaboration of the argument presented in the earlier paper by the same author (No. 8). It is argued that "the traditional view that choice of capital-intensity should be governed by factor proportions" will hold only if the ratio of wages to labour productivity with any given technique is lower in under-developed than in developed countries. It is also argued that, in setting a ceiling on the proportion of investment that can be devoted to the capital-goods sector (and in defining the maximum possible growth-rate of the economy), "both the capital-intensity of investment and the level of wages will enter as determining factors".

10. Dobb M., *An Essay on Economic Growth and Planning*, London 1960. pp. vii, 119.

    In this study the implications of investment policy for the growth potential of a planned economy are examined. The potential rate of investment in an economy being fixed by the size of the existing surplus in the consumer goods sector, the only degree of freedom in investment policy is with respect to the choice of the technical form of investment. The author's mode of presentation focuses attention on productivity—in the consumer goods sector and in the investment sector —as factors in growth rates, and the analysis of the choice of techniques is carried out at two stages, separately for the consumer goods sector and the investment sector.

    It is shown that a choice of technology which maximizes output and consumption in the present will not maximize the growth rate. If, as the author favours, the growth rate is to be maximized, the choice of techniques in the consumer goods sector will call for a higher capital intensity the higher is the wage rate as compared to productivity in

the consumer goods sector. The best choice of production period will be determined by the difference made at an earlier date to surplus by enhanced productivity. The choice of technique in the investment sector is also shown to be dependent on the surplus ratio in the consumption goods sector and the larger the wage rate in relation to surplus the greater the capital intensity. The analysis of the conditions for choice of technique in each sector independently is held to be valid, as the same wage rate is assumed for both the sectors and what maximizes the surplus in the consumer goods sector still maximizes the growth rate. In translating the "real relations" (i.e. of products to labour) in choice of technology into price relations, the author indicates the need for an *agio* (or discount) in the price of capital goods, to be derived from the ratio of surplus to wages in the consumer goods sector. For "only if the relation (of the price of capital goods to the wage) is the same as that which in the consumer goods sector is a measure of the rate of investment will the choice of technique be consistent with that rate of investment".

11. Eckaus, R. S., "The Factor Proportions Problem in Underdeveloped Countries", *American Economic Review*, Sept. 1955, pp. 539-65.

    The paper is intended to help clarify some of the underlying issues involved in such concepts as "structural disequilibrium", "overpopulation", "technological unemployment" and "under-employment" in under-developed areas, and "to begin to provide a theoretical basis for their analysis".

12. Eckstein, O., "Investment Criteria for Economic Development and the Theory of Intertemporal Welfare Economics", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Feb. 1957, pp. 56-85.

    An indication of the "criteria that are needed for project selection, given some of the specific market imperfections found in under-developed countries, and particularly assuming that the capital market performs its functions poorly or not at all". It is argued that if a satisfactory rate of capital accumulation cannot be achieved by purely fiscal means, the investment criterion "must reflect both the project's direct contribution to consumers' welfare as well as the indirect contribution made possible by the generated addition to the capital stock". The optimal combination of the interest rate and the growth rate is also discussed.

13. The Economic Stabilization Board, Government of the Republic of China, "Allocation of Scarce Resources", (prepared for the first meeting of the Working Party on Economic Development and Planning of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, Bangkok, 1955) (mimeographed) (DPWP.1/21), pp. 6.

    "A mutual benefit" principle may be used to test the worth of any economic measures. In this respect four beneficiaries need to be considered: the government, capital, labour and the consumer.

14. Enke, S., "Speculations on Population Growth and Economic Development", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Feb. 1957, pp. 19-35.

    The thesis of the article is that "there may be substantial long-run advantages in investing in urban facilities and plants, rather than in increasing the food supply through, say, land reclamation projects". It is argued that "plans for the economic development of densely populated countries, having high death and birth rates, must seek kinds of investment that will eventually decrease population relative to the supply of consumption goods". See also an article by W. Galenson and H. Leibenstein (No. 16).

15. Fleming, M., "External Economies and the Doctrine of Balanced Growth", *Economic Journal*, June 1955, pp. 241-56.

    A critical examination of the basic assumptions underlying the theory of balanced growth as advanced, for example, by R. Nurkse (No. 24). It is concluded that "the argument, as usually presented, overemphasizes the repercussions on the demand for, and ignores repercussions on the costs of, the other industries, and that, in an economy where factors of production are in fixed supply, the introduction of unprofitable though efficient large-scale production in one industry is more likely to reduce than to increase the profitability of other industries". However, "the chances are much better for a 'vertical' propagation of external economies, from customer industry to supplying industry". See also notes by R. Nurkse, *ibid.*, June 1956, pp. 365-7, and by M. Fleming *ibid.*, Sept. 1956, pp. 537-9.

16. Galenson, W. and Leibenstein, H., "Investment Criteria, Productivity and Economic Development". *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Aug. 1955, pp. 343-70.

    Continuing the discussion pursued by A. E. Kahn (No. 20) and H. B. Chenery (No. 4), the authors "call attention to shortcomings occasioned by the failure of economic theory in dealing with economic growth, to relax some of the assumptions that are relevant in treating static problems". It is argued that "the best allocation of investment resources is achieved by equating the 'marginal per capita reinvestment quotient' of capital in its various alternative uses", with the result of maximizing the per capita output potential at some future point in time. See comments on the article by H. Neisser, with a reply by the authors, *ibid.*, Nov. 1956, pp. 644-8, by J. Moes, *ibid.*, Feb., 1957, pp. 161-4, and by H. H. Villard, with a reply, *ibid.*, August 1957, pp. 470-5.

17. The Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, "Note on the Fixing of Priorities in the Establishment on Economic Rehabilitation Plan in Viet-Nam" (prepared for the second meeting of the Working Party on Economic Development and Planning of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, Bangkok, 1956) (mimeographed) (DPWP.2/13), pp. 24.

General orientation of development towards agriculture supported by development of light industry, and the diversification of production should be the basic lines of economic development in southern Viet-Nam. In the selection of investment projects, emphasis should be laid on such factors as quick returns, creation of additional employment, and earning and saving of foreign exchange.

18. Gulhati, R. I., "Criteria for Allocating Investment in Underdeveloped Economies", *Indian Economic Review*, Feb. 1957, pp. 107-14.

"An attempt to define the areas of selective applicability of various criteria". It is argued that the problem can be tackled "more effectively if the aggregate economy is broken up into meaningful sectors".

19. Hirschman, A. D., *The Strategy of Economic Development*, New Haven 1959, pp. xiii, 217.

"Heartily disagreeing" with the balanced growth doctrine, the author favours planned "imbalances" leading to "manageable tensions and challenges which the underdeveloped countries can hope to resolve more successfully". Imbalances can be created through autonomous investment inducing further investments, either through the pressure of excess demand generated for products ("backward linkage effect") or through excess supply of its products ("forward linkage effect"). Where industrial investments which can provide both such inducements are not available, generation of pressures through excess demand is to be preferred, as illustrated by two specific cases. While a minimum social overhead investment is necessary for economic development, direct productive investment should be preferred to stimulating economic development through the creation of excess capacity in public utilities. Expansion of public utilities could then be left to the working of the pressure of excess demand generated by the direct productive investment.

Stressing the dynamic role of imports as the creator of new wants, the author points to their effect in building up a market which the indigenous manufacturer can take over. The stimulus to excess demand created by such import-replacing investment could be exaggerated. If the pressure is not to be leaked out in further imports of capital goods and raw materials, the underdeveloped countries should give preference to investment in the production of goods which can not only go into final demand but also supply the inputs to as many industries as possible. The successful working of such a pressure on the process of economic development, as envisaged by the author, seems to rest on expectation of favourable response in the supply of requirements of production like natural resources, entrepreneurship and foreign exchange.

20. Kahn, A. E., "Investment Criteria in Development Programmes", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Feb. 1951, pp. 38-61.

It is argued that various suggested criteria for selecting investment projects, such as those analysed by Buchanan (No. 2) and Polak (No. 41), are essentially erroneous, though they may be useful as practical rules-of-thumb. The correct criterion is "social marginal productivity (SMP), taking into account the total net contribution of the marginal unit to national product, and not merely that portion of the contribution (or of its cost) which may accrue to the private investor".

21. Leibenstein, H., *Economic Backwardness and Economic Growth.* Studies in the Theory of Economic Development. New York, 1957, pp. xiv, 295.

After setting out the problem of economic inequality, an analysis of economic backwardness and of the factors underlying the transition to sustained growth is undertaken. Statistical material relevant to the analysis is presented and the book is concluded by a chapter on investment allocation policy. See also a paper by W. Galenson and H. Leibenstein (No. 16).

22. Martin, K., "Capital-Output Ratios in Economic Development", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. VI, No. 1, Oct. 1957, pp. 24-31.

An attempt to answer, on the basis of capital-output ratios, the question "How much capital must a country save or borrow abroad for domestic investment in order to attain a certain rate of economic growth?"

23. Novozhilov, V. V., "On Choosing Between Investment Projects", *International Economic papers*, No. 6, pp. 66-87.

A translation of two contributions to the Soviet discussion of the subject. One is "Methods of comparing the economic effectiveness of alternative processes of production", and the other "Methods of determining minimum cost in a socialist economy".

24. Nurkse, R., *Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries.* Oxford, 1953, pp. 163.

This study examines the weakness of investment incentives in under-developed countries resulting from the smallness of the market. With regard to capital supply, the potential savings concealed in rural under-employment is emphasized. But it is argued that the demonstration effect of high living standards in the developed countries makes saving difficult in under-developed countries. The book incorporates material separately published in *American Economic Review* (Papers and Proceedings Supp.), May 1952, and *Some Aspects of Capital Accumulation in Under-Developed Countries*, Cairo, 1952.

25. Quayyum A., *Theory and Policy of Accounting Prices*, Amsterdam, 1959 pp. vii, 123.

The problem of finding the accounting prices i.e. the imputed values of the factors of production, is dealt with in a linear programming model where

the cost of total production is minimized, given the prices or the weights attached to the final commodities, the technological possibilities of production and the amounts of factors available. The study assumes away the problems in the choice of maximization of output as against employment and also in the choice of quantitative weights to be attached to the final commodities.

The method of arriving at accounting prices is illustrated, with numerical examples, in the case of three factors of production to be used in the total production of two commodities, each of which can be produced in two ways. The method of expressing the accounting prices in terms of existing interest and wage rates, the administration of accounting prices through a system of taxes and subsidies, the effect of the policy of accounting prices on the rate of savings and the growth of national product are also discussed.

26. Raj, K. N., "Application of Investment Criteria in the Choice between Projects", *Indian Economic Review*, Aug. 1956, pp. 22-30.

An attempt to answer the question: "given the investment allocation . . . and the alternative technical possibilities, how are the different projects and project designs to be ranked and some selected in preference to others?". It is particularly concerned with "investments which are meant to build up the overheads of economic development". The article is part of a report on *Some Economic Aspects of the Bhakra Nangal Project* prepared at the instance of the Research Programmes Committee of the Planning Commission.

27. Scitovsky, Tibor, "Growth — Balanced or Unbalanced?" in *The Allocation of Economic Resources* (Essays in Honour of B. F. Haley), Stanford, 1959 pp. 207-217.

A particular feature of this study is the analysis of how foreign trade by converting an "unbalanced pattern of output into a balanced pattern of availabilities" can always secure the advantages of balanced growth to an unbalanced economy. Even when, within an economy, regionally concentrated growth is balanced within the region concerned, the growth often centres round a few industries and the consequent unbalance in the region's output is made up through intra-regional trade. Hence the trend towards integration and formation of large economic areas.

28. Sen. A. K., "Some Notes on the Choice of Capital-Intensity in Development Planning", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Nov. 1957, pp. 561-84.

A criticism of the criteria suggested by other writers, such as the rate of capital turnover, social marginal productivity and the rate of reinvestment. As an alternative, the author suggests a criterion based on the period-of-recovery approach. The discussion is concerned only with the problem of the choice of techniques for the consumer goods sector.

29. Sen, A. K. *Choice of Techniques*, Oxford 1960, pp. 122.

The author considers the problem of the optimum capital intensity to be chosen by a state controlled industrial sector, which employs at a constant real wage labour drawn from a peasant sector where there are large reserves of surplus labour. A simple model is used to clarify the distinction between maximizing the re-investible surplus of production in the planned sector and maximizing production itself. The criteria that follow from each of these choices of a maximand are shown to be extreme positions on the question of choice between alternative time paths of consumption.

A more elaborate model where choice of techniques is considered for the investment goods as well as the consumer goods sector is then set up. The model is solved for the optimal capital intensities on the assumption that the desideratum is to maximize the total flow of consumption through a given period.

Various complicating factors such as international trade are considered in later chapters. The problem of social time preference is discussed in general terms in the last chapter, which criticizes the attempts of Tinbergen and Eckstein to apply utility analysis to the problem. There are four appendices, in two of which the author makes an effort to discuss the choice of techniques in the cotton spinning and weaving industries in India.

30. Strumilin, S. G., "The Time Factor in Capital Investment Projects", *International Economic Papers*, No. 1, pp. 160-85.

A discussion of the "planning of the most advantageous constructional projects in such a way as to take account of the influence of the time-factor on their comparative efficiency". It is translated from the *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.*, 1946. See also M. Dobb's paper (No. 8).

31. Tinbergen, J., *The Design of Development*. Baltimore, 1958, pp. 99.

This study covers the elements of development policy, problems of programming, project appraisal and methods of stimulating private investment. As a desirable investment criterion, the author suggests a national product (or consumption) test based on "accounting prices" which reflect intrinsic values of goods and services, especially of factors of production.

32. United Nations Department of Economic Affairs, *Measures for the Economic Development of Under-Developed Countries*. Report by a Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. United Nations Publication, Sales No. 1951.II.B.2, pp. ix, 108.

This report consists of four parts, namely "Introduction", "Measures requiring domestic action", "Measures requiring international action"

and "Recommendations". A general discussion of priorities and techniques of development planning is included in Part 2. Discussed among others are choices (*a*) between consumption and investment, (*b*) between investment in human beings and investment in material capital, (*c*) between public works and other productive activity, (*d*) between autarchy and foreign trade, and (*e*) between industry and agriculture. The authors of the report are A. B. Cortez, D. R. Gadgil, G. Hakim, W. A. Lewis and T. W. Schultz.

33. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, "Problems and Techniques of Economic Development Planning and Programming with Special Reference to ECAFE countries", *Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East,* Vol. VI, No. 3, Nov. 1955, pp. 25-62.

    Includes a section on aspects of programme formulation discussing various criteria for the determination of development priorities, e.g. (*a*) criteria of social productivity; (*b*) increase in aggregate investment; (*c*) creation of external economies; (*d*) population factors; (*e*) maximization of employment; (*f*) low capital-output ratio; (*g*) balance of payments effect and (*h*) stability.

34. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, "Allocation of Resources for Investment in Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Development", *Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East,* Vol. VIII, No. 3, Nov. 1957 (Economic Development and Planning in Asia and the Far East: The Agricultural Sector), pp. 56-66.

    The extent to which the two allocations diverge in practice would depend on various factors, especially the demand pattern and the production functions in the respective sectors, which differ from country to country, from region to region and from one point of time to another, especially in the agricultural sector.

35. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, *Programming Techniques for Economic Development* (Report of a Group of Experts) Bangkok 1960, United Nations Publication, Sales No. 60.II.F.3, pp. 130.

    The report aims at reviewing and summing up the developments in the techniques and methods of planning, and presenting them in a form useful to official planning bodies—especially those in the ECAFE region—in the preparation of a comprehensive and logically consistent plan. The discussion proceeds from simple to complex models, on the assumption that the country will use the model which could be constructed with the information available to it. The data requirements of the various models are given in the relevant parts of the report.

    As a first step in development programming, the general rate of development could be projected, given estimates of current savings and the capital-output ratio. Next, broad sectors of the economy are distinguished like the consumption and investment goods sectors, export sector and home market, farms and industries. Techniques are indicated for planning, consistent with overall rate of growth, the approximate rates of development of different sectors (or a combination of them, if there is only one investment goods sector). Where data on inter-industrial relations are available, the use of linear programming models for planning the development of a large number of sectors is discussed, and illustrated in the case of maximization of output under the economic constraints generally faced by the planners.

    The report discusses the problems in the practical appraisal of the direct and indirect effects of projects while integrating them into an investment plan; in the use and estimation of accounting prices in valuation of the projects; in planning short-term adjustments to external disturbances, and in planning manpower, education and income distribution, etc. Problems in planning the development of different regions are discussed and are illustrated with the help of a multi-sectoral, dynamic, input-output model, taking into systematic consideration some of the most important relationships between regions as well as sectors. The report carries a selected bibliography on programming techniques.

36. United Nations Technical Assistance Administration, *Formulation and Economic Appraisal of Development Projects.* Vol. I. United Nations Publications, Sales No. 1951.II.B.4, pp. xiv, 473.

    Lectures delivered at the Asian Centre on Agricultural and Allied Projects held in Lahore, Pakistan, in Oct.-Dec. 1950 under the joint sponsorship of the Government of Pakistan, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the United Nations. Vol. I reproduces six general lectures, including "Development Projects as Part of National Development Programmes", by H. W. Singer; "Appraising Costs and Benefits of Development Projects", by J. T. Lund. See also Vol. II (No. 66).

37. Vaidyanathan, A., "A Survey of the Literature on 'Investment Criteria' for the Development of Underdeveloped Countries", *Indian Economic Journal,* Oct. 1956, pp. 122-44.

    A review of "the ideas expressed in the available literature bearing on the question of 'Investment Criteria".

B. Balance of Payments

38. Das Gupta, A. K., International Monetary Fund, "Effect of an Investment Programme on Foreign Exchange Reserves", *Mobilization of Domestic Capital: Report and Documents of the Working Party of Experts,* United Nations Publications, Sales No. 1953.II.F.4, pp. 310-16.

    The paper argues that whether an export surplus of a required magnitude is to be forth-

coming when the targets of the plan are achieved, depends very largely on what types of investment the plans envisage.

39. Department of Economic Research, Central Bank of the Philippines, "Criteria for the Allocation of Foreign Exchange for Development" (prepared for the first meeting of the Working Party on Economic Development and Planning of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, Bangkok, 1955) (mimeographed) (DPWP.1/18), pp. 11.

This study is presented not as a final method of apportionment of foreign exchange, but as a workable system designed to meet transitional needs of the economy, while the more scientific method of input-output system is being developed.

40. Liang, C. C., International Monetary Fund, "The Impact of Different Types of Foreign Investment on the Balance of Payments Position of the Far East Countries", *Mobilization of Domestic Capital: Report and Documents of the Working Party of Experts,* United Nations Publication, Sales No. 1953.II.F.4, pp. 291-309.

A paragraph is devoted to the choice of development projects from the point of view of balance of payments.

41. Polak, J. J., "Balance of Payments Problems of Countries Reconstructing with the Help of Foreign Loans", *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* Feb. 1943, pp. 208-40. Reprinted in American Economic Association, *Readings in the Theory of International Trade,* pp. 459-93.

An analysis of the different effects on the balance of payments of various types of investment projects financed by foreign loans. The article seeks to establish the magnitude and direction of investment which can be carried out with a foreign loan of given size, without there being balance of payments difficulties, either during the period of investment or when the capital goods created come into operation. The author suggests that, along with a few other considerations such as the export possibility of the goods produced, a high rate of capital turnover should be the criterion for choosing among different investment projects. See also papers by A. E. Kahn (No. 20) and H. B. Chenery (No. 4).

42. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, "Relation between Foreign Capital and the Mobilization of Domestic Capital", *Mobilization of Domestic Capital: Report and Documents of the Working Party of Experts,* United Nations Publication, Sales No. 1953.II.F.4, pp. 270-90.

Part I of this paper considers the relations between foreign capital and public expenditures, while Part II is concerned with foreign capital and the private sector. There is a technical appendix to the paper, discussing in more detail the measurement of the foreign exchange requirements of expenditure programmes.

C. Industry

43. Bhatt, V. V., "Capital-Output Ratios of Certain Industries: A Comparative Study of Certain Countries", *Review of Economics and Statistics,* Aug. 1954, pp. 309-19.

The empirical evidence for a number of countries, both developed and underdeveloped, does not support the expectation that capital-output ratios are lower (for the same manufacturing industries) in the less-developed than in the more-developed countries. For some manufacturing industries, the more advanced countries do indeed have higher capital-output ratios, but for a great many manufacturing industries, quite the reverse appears to be the case. Data are drawn from Australia, Canada, India, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, South Africa and the United States. See also "A Note on Capital-Output Ratios" by R. N. Grosse, *ibid.,* Aug. 1955, p. 305, and an article by V. V. Bhatt (No. 44).

44. Bhatt, V. V., "Capital Intensity of Industries: A Comparative Survey of Certain Countries", *Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Statistics,* May 1956, pp. 179-94.

The author discusses various technological factors affecting capital intensity of the industries of the underdeveloped economies as compared with that of the corresponding industries of the developed economies, and suggests that "the underdeveloped economies . . . have not been able to develop a new technology suited to their own economic conditions". See also an article by the same author (No. 43).

45. Bohr, K. A., "Investment Criteria for Manufacturing Industries in Underdeveloped Countries", *Review of Economics and Statistics,* May 1954, pp. 157-66.

An attempt "to indicate by an analysis of industrial characteristics the extent to which various industries may be adapted to the conditions usually found in underdeveloped economies". The characteristics selected for study are "the requirements of capital and skilled labour, plant size and locational pattern".

46. Chenery, H. B., "The Interdependence of Investment Decisions", in the *Allocation of Economic Resources* (Essays in Honour of B. F. Haley), Stanford 1959, pp. 82-120.

With the help of an activity analysis model, the study examines the extent and the circumstances under which co-ordinated investment decisions lead to more efficient resource use than individual decisions based on existing market information. The parameters in the model were based on a comparison of inter-industry structure in four industrialized countries: Latin American data were used for the steel industry and Japanese labour and capital coefficients for the remaining sectors.

Two assumptions are made about the investors' behaviour. Investment can take place (*a*) in sectors

which yield profits greater than or equal to the existing marginal productivity of capital at existing prices and amounts determined by present demands for the commodity or (*b*) in sectors and in amounts which together will supply the final bill of goods at the minimum total cost. The total capital used directly and indirectly to produce a unit of net output is calculated separately for each of the assumptions regarding investors' behaviour, and the difference between the amounts required is taken to be a measure of the quantitative advantage of the interdependence of investment decisions.

The analysis is extended to cover, in addition to the saving in factor use, (*a*) the income effects arising from economies of scale in sectors outside the model, (*b*) the physical propinquity of different types of production, (*c*) substitution in production and consumption, and (*d*) changes over time. The study arrives at the well-known conclusion that "the sectors in which correct initial investments are critical to securing optimal results are those that have the most significant economies of scale and those for which imports do not provide a substitute".

47. Chenery, H. B., "Patterns of Industrial Growth", *American Economic Review*, Vol. L, No. 4, September 1960, pp. 624-654.

In contradiction to the usual assumption that changes in the composition of demand are the main cause of industrial growth, the study incorporates changes in both demand and supply conditions into a general explanation of the growth patterns of the various sectors in industrial production. A general equilibrium model is constructed, from which sector growth functions are derived allowing for changes in demand and in factor proportions, and a simplified version of this model is tested with the help of regression analysis of production and import data of various countries. "Changes in supply conditions, resulting from a change in relative factor cost as income rises, cause a substitution of domestic production for imports and, to a lesser extent, of factory goods for handicrafts goods and services. These supply changes are more important in explaining the growth of industry than are the changes in demand".

48. Granick, D., "Economic Development and Productivity Analysis: The Case of Soviet Metalworking", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 1957, pp. 205-33.

It is argued that Soviet policy in metalworking has "followed orthodox Western economic doctrine of substituting plentiful factors for scarce ones", and that most recent western technology could not be simply copied because "technology and production organization are inseparately linked and . . . must, to a considerable extent, be developed anew in each country".

49. Holzman, F. D., "The Soviet Ural-Kuznetsk Combine: A Study in Investment Criteria and Industrialization Policies", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Aug. 1957, pp. 368-405.

The article outlines the history of the combine, and develops a new social marginal productivity criterion for evaluating it as an investment project which takes into account not only social economies and diseconomies, but also the rate of growth and the time horizon of planning.

50. The Office of National Planning, National Economic Council, Philippines, "A Proposed System of Determining Industrial Priorities for the Philippines" (prepared for the second meeting of the Working Party on Economic Development and Planning of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, Bangkok, 1956) (mimeographed) (DPWP. 2/16), pp. 24.

A proposed formula for determining priority rating of industrial firms takes account of the contribution to the national income, the impact on the balance of payments, the utilization of domestic raw materials as well as the employment effect.

51. Rosentein—Rodan, P. N., "Problems of Industrialization of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe", *Economic Journal*, June-Sept. 1943, pp. 202-11.

The author emphasizes the interdependence between production and markets, and argues that individual projects may appear unattractive propositions because of limited size of the market, but if a number of projects are taken together, each supporting the others, the collective programme can be made profitable.

52. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, "Criteria for Selecting Particular Industries for Establishment or Expansion", *Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East*, Vol. IX, No. 3, Dec. 1958 (Economic Development and Planning in Asia and the Far East: Industrialization), pp. 38-51.

Basically, international specialization provides major determinants in the selection of industries for establishment or expansion. (In this respect, a distinction is made between natural resources—and raw materials-oriented industries on the one hand and market-oriented industries on the other). From the point of view of a developing economy, however, the indirect contribution to the society of a new industry has also to be taken into account, the possibility of differences between the market prices and the "intrinsic value" of the factors of production should be considered and the relation of the project to future development is also important. The use of "accounting prices" is briefly discussed.

53. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, "The Choice of Scale and Techniques of Production", *Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East:* Vol. IX, No. 3, Dec. 1958 (Economic Development and Planning in Asia and the Far East: Industrialization), pp. 51-56.

The relative merits of labour-intensive and the capital-intensive production in the labour-abundant and capital-scarce economies of Asia are evaluated.

D. Agriculture

54. Investigation Commission on Basic Problems of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of Japan, *Basic Problems in Agriculture and Orientation of Government's Basic Action Programmes in Japan*, Recommendations to the Government of Japan, Tokyo, 1960, (mimeographed), pp. 72.

    The report recommends basic lines to be kept in the allocation of government agricultural investment, to help solve the basic problems of Japan's agriculture. Special emphasis in agricultural investment policy should be put on the improvement of agricultural structure through the enlargement of farm size, the encouragement of co-operative farm management, and consolidation of holdings. Government investment in land improvements such as irrigation and drainage are supported to increase productivity and reduce costs, despite the fact that domestic rice production has almost met domestic demand. However, price support programmes, crop insurance and land reclamation should be undertaken only in conformity with the efficient use of government funds and oriented to encourage the major objective of modernization of the Japanese agriculture.

55. Johnston, B. F., and Mellor, J. W., "The Nature of Agriculture's Contributions to Economic Development", Reprinted from *Food Research Institute Studies*, California, U.S.A., Vol. I, No. 3, November 1960, pp. 334-356.

    The focus is on the importance of agriculture as a potential source of capital formation required for over-all economic growth of underdeveloped countries. It is recognized that the increase of farm output and productivity should make a substantial contribution to over-all economic growth and can or should be brought about by methods that "make very limited demands on resources of high opportunity cost which are essential for industrial expansion".

56. Ohkawa, K., and Rosovsky, H., "The Role of Agriculture in Modern Japanese Economic Development", *Economic Development and Cultural Change;* University of Chicago, 1960, pp. 43-67.

    This paper presents an economic analysis from the side of agriculture of the major factors which contributed to the Japanese economic breakthrough in the nineteenth century and made for sustained rapid growth in the ensuing period. In connexion with capital formation, it is indicated by reference to the capital coefficient and the saving rate in agriculture, that during the initial stage of industrialization, the investments currently needed in agriculture were smaller than the savings generated by this sector, so that the resulting surplus could be siphoned off to the non-agricultural sector. In addition, the allocation of government subsidies between agriculture and industry during the process of industrialization is discussed.

57. Schvenger, B. R., "Export of Capital? Agricultural Policy, Politics, and the Public Interest", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 331, September 1960, pp. 20-25.

    Capital investments needed for the agricultural development of an underdeveloped country are divided into the following three categories: (1) direct investment in agriculture — land, labour, materials, livestock, machinery, etc. (2) indirect investment to benefit agriculture—major irrigation and power projects, fertilizer plants, etc. and (3) investment not consciously directed to agriculture, but primarily to the development of industry. Examining the volume and availability of capital needed in underdeveloped countries by the above categories, the report discusses which category should have first priority in foreign capital investment, especially U.S. investment in the form of agricultural surpluses.

58. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, "Criteria and Techniques for Selection of Best Technical Means for Agricultural Expansion", *Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, Nov. 1957 (Economic Development and Planning in Asia and the Far East: The Agricultural Sector), pp. 48-55.

    This paper by FAO deals first with the possibilities and relative advantages of various technical means for agricultural expansion, and secondly with features of cost and benefit analysis in underdeveloped areas. An appendix illustrates the application of the cost and benefit analysis to the Shihmen Reservoir Project in China: Taiwan.

59. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, "Report of the Working Party on Economic Development and Planning (Third Session) to the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (Fourteenth Session)", *Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, Nov. 1957, pp. 1-22.

    The third session of the Working Party concentrated on the agricultural sector and was co-sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The report includes a discussion of the usefulness and limitations of the cost and benefit analysis as a technique for economic appraisal of agricultural projects. The usefulness and limitations of various criteria and techniques for allocation of resources among different sectors are also examined. See also Nos. 34 and 58.

60. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, *Report of the FAO/ECAFE Expert Group on Selected Aspects of Agricultural Planning, Bangkok* 1961, (mimeographed), pp. 83.

    It covers, *interalia*, the usefulness and limitations of input-output relationships, especially capital-output ratio and labour-output ratio, in agricultural planning as a criterion in the sectoral allocation of resources between agriculture and non-agriculture. In view of the qualifications and limitations of capital-output ratio, this ratio may best be applied to the economic appraisal of the sectoral allocation of capital investment in a broad sense.

In addition to average capital-output ratio, the concepts of incremental and working capital-output ratio are examined. The report is being printed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

E. Water Resources Development

61. Eckstein, O., "Water-Resources Development". Cambridge, Massaschusetts, U.S.A., 1958, pp. x, 300.

This is a detailed study on the economics of water-resource programmes. In particular, the procedures by means of which the merit of projects such as irrigation and flood control is evaluated are analysed. The cost-benefit criterion is derived from the theory of welfare economics.

Benefit-cost analysis is viewed as a promising evaluation method for public expenditures, which could put policy judgments on a much firmer economic basis than is usually possible. Ideally, benefit-cost ratio would permit the ranking of projects in the same field, and comparing of projects in different fields. But a benefit-cost ratio above 1.0 does not mean that a project will actually produce more benefit than its cost even if the forecasts of prices prove to be correct. Nor is it possible to assume that projects in different fields with equal benefit-cost ratio have the same economic merit. Thus it is most desirable that benefit-cost techniques should be properly applied, bringing in as many relevant factors as possible.

The author points out that in an under-developed economy, benefit-cost analyses would have to include implicit forecasts of project outputs as the structure of the economy evolves, as well as direct estimates of the social costs of the factors of production which the project absorbs. In addition, it will usually not be possible to partition the investment problem into simple choices among independent projects; the benefit-cost analysis of any one project will depend on the outputs produced by other projects and on the general pattern of the development effort.

62. Estacio, F., "Economic and Social Problems of Water Supply and Control in Portugal", *International Journal of Agrarian Affairs,* Vol. II, No. 5, June 1959, pp. 391-404.

The author indicates the problems involved in establishing priorities for future hydro-agricultural works such as irrigation, drainage, etc. The basic elements for determining priorities are: increase of production, higher standards of life for the agricultural population, increase in employment and improvement in the balance of payments. Moreover, from the technical as well as from the administrative point of view, big irrigation works should demand public intervention and investments, and small works could be left to private initiative, eventually with the state's financial aid.

63. Sub-Committee on Benefits and Costs, Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee, *Proposed Practices for Economic Analysis of River Basin Projects.* Washington, D.C., 1950, pp. ix, 85.

This report presents the conclusions and recommendations resulting from a series of studies in the United States, made for the purpose of developing acceptable principles and procedures for determining benefits and costs of water resources development projects. The main items discussed are the basic assumptions and principles involved in the benefit-cost analysis; standards, problems and procedures involved in the measurement of benefits and costs; the application of principles and procedures for analysis of various project purposes; and the application of benefit-cost data in allocation of costs among project purposes.

64. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Integrated River Basin Development.* United Nations Publication, Sales No.: 1958, II.B.3, pp. viii, 60.

Report by a panel of experts on the technological, social and economic aspects of river basin development planning, and on the lines of action to be taken at national and international levels. Problems of economic evaluation are discussed briefly in chapter 3.

65. United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, *Multiple-Purpose River Basin Development, Part 1: Manual of River Basin Planning.* United Nations Publication, Sales No.: 1955, II.F.1, pp. vii, 79.

The manual is intended to describe and discuss the basic problems arising in the preparation of a comprehensive river basin plan. Chapter III discusses economic aspects of river basin planning, including the techniques of benefit-cost analysis to be used for the economic evaluation of river basin projects, as well as financial feasibility and reimbursement and allocation of costs.

66. United Nations Technical Assistance Administration, *Formulation and Economic Appraisal of Development Projects.* Vol. II, United Nations Publication, Sales No.: 1951, II.B.4, pp. vii, 481-780.

Lectures delivered at the Asian Centre on Agricultural and Allied Projects held in Lahore, Pakistan, in October-December 1950 under the joint sponsorship of the Government of Pakistan, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the United Nations. Vol. II reproduces fourteen lectures on special problems of economic development, mostly of a rather technical character, on such topics as land reclamation, grain storage and multiple-purpose river projects. Economic appraisal based on the benefit-cost analysis is discussed with regard to river valley projects and flood control projects. See also *ibid.*, Vol. I (No. 36).

67. United States Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources; "The Supply of and Demand for Water", *Water Resources Activities in the United States,* Washington, D.C. August, 1960, pp. 129.

Report on the United States prospective supply of and demand for water in 1980 and 2000. The prospective demand is estimated by major uses including irrigation, industries, and home uses. After examining the supply capacity of water by regions, storage requirements, the annual costs of storage and waste treatment programmes, and the relationships between annual costs and capital costs, the report proceeds to examine the allocation of water among competing uses. It is concluded that "as the intensity of water use relative to available supply increases, the matter of allocating water among uses becomes an integral part of water resource development, and planning of water use will become an inseparable component of general economic planning."

68. Zegarra, J. M., "Peru's Water Resources" *International Journal of Agrarian Affairs,* Vol. II, No. 6, July 1960, pp. 463-480.

Includes a comparison between the economic and social advantages to be derived from a given investment in one large-scale irrigation project as against a number of small-scale irrigation schemes. Comparing the two types of scheme from the agricultural point of view and from the standpoint of the economy of the area and of the national economy, the cases considered in Peru reveal that large irrigation schemes have the following three advantages over small schemes: (1) lower cost per unit of area irrigated, (2) larger areas made cultivable, and (3) higher output and, therefore, greater saving of foreign currency resources. From the social point of view, the larger schemes make it possible to settle a larger number of families. These conclusions, however, are based on the assumption that the quality and productivity of soils in the various areas are similar.

ASIAN ECONOMIC STATISTICS

List of Tables

UNITS AND SYMBOLS EMPLOYED

Unless otherwise stated "tons" relate to metric tons, and "dollars" relate to United States dollars.

The following symbols have been used throughout:

* = 12 months beginning 20-23 March of the year stated.
‡ = 12 months beginning April of the year stated.
† = 12 months ending September of the year stated.
ø = 12 months ending June of the year stated.
Mn = million.
I, II, III, and IV for quarters of years.

. = not applicable.
... = not available.
— = nil or negligible.
r = revised figures from this issue.
Figures in italics are provisional or unofficial.
Figures in brackets are from national sources.

Substantial breaks in the homogeneity of a series are indicated either by a horizontal line across the column or by vertical double lines in a row of figures.

SOURCES

To ensure comparability, data compiled or published by the United Nations Statistical Office have been incorporated wherever feasible; material supplied by governments, publications of governments, of the United Nations specialized agencies and of international commodity study groups have been used as additional sources.

REGIONAL STATISTICS

1. REGIONAL STATISTICAL SERIES

Annual and quarterly figures

	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV
POPULATION *(Midyear, million)*													
Including mainland China	1,388	1,412	1,435	1,464	...	...	...	...	.	.	.	.	.
Excluding mainland China	806	817	826	843	856	868	885	899	...	.	.	.	.
AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION[a]													
Index of agricultural production *(1952/53—1956/57=100)*													
All commodities	98	100	104	107	105	109	113	...	.	.	.	.	.
Food	99	100	103	107	105	109	113	...	.	.	.	.	.
Per capita food	100	100	102	104	100	103	105	...	.	.	.	.	.
Cereals *(million tons)*													
Rice (paddy)	111.3	104.3	113.2	119.5	110.1	124.3	128.3	...	.	.	.	.	.
Wheat	15.7	17.7	18.4	18.6	19.6	17.8	20.8	...	.	.	.	.	.
Maize	7.1	8.0	7.1	8.1	8.2	9.3	9.3	...	.	.	.	.	.
Millet and sorghums	18.5	18.2	15.5	15.4	16.6	18.0	16.8	...	.	.	.	.	.
Starchy root crops *(million tons)*													
Potatoes	5.8	5.8	5.9	5.9	6.8	7.2	6.8	...	.	.	.	.	.
Sweet potatoes and Yams	12.8	13.3	15.3	15.7	15.0	15.8	16.6	...	.	.	.	.	.
Cassava	11.8	12.8	12.4	12.1	13.3	14.5	15.3	...	.	.	.	.	.
Oilseeds *(million tons)*													
Groundnuts (in shell)	4.2	5.0	4.7	5.1	5.5	5.9	5.5	...	.	.	.	.	.
Copra	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.2	2.2	...	.	.	.	.	.
Tea *(thousand tons)*	553	615	634	634	651	660	650	602	180	89	149	197	166
Tobacco *(million tons)*	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	...	.	.	.	.	.
Fibres *(million tons)*													
Cotton (lint)	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.1	...	.	.	.	.	.
Jute	1.5	1.6	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.1	...	.	.	.	.	.
Natural rubber *(thousand tons)*	1,640	1,735	1,815	1,771	1,783	1,799	1,923	1,822	544	442	437	447	496
INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION													
Index of industrial production[b] *(1953=100)*													
Mining and manufacturing	100	110	123	145	166	168	200	239	215	232	234	237	252
Mining	100	100	116	133	149	150	156	174	163	168	170	175	184
Manufacturing	100	111	124	147	168	171	206	248	222	240	243	246	261
Food beverages, tobacco	100	100	115	124	131	136	142	152	141	195	131	129	151
Textiles	100	111	122	137	144	138	152	164	160	158	164	167	168
Paper and paper products	100	114	131	151	168	169	209	243	226	231	236	247	258
Chemicals, petroleum and coal products	100	113	133	159	184	192	217	261	232	251	259	259	274
Non-metallic mineral products	100	115	120	141	165	170	192	226	209	214	225	223	240
Basic metals	100	110	119	140	155	149	196	254	220	230	247	260	280
Metal products	100	116	126	177	231	243	344	470	400	416	457	486	522
Coal *(million tons)*	88.5	85.3	86.9	92.8	103.1	103.2	104.4	114.0	26.8	27.5	28.1	27.6	30.8
Iron ore *(million tons)*	7.70	8.41	8.91	10.34	11.55	12.09	15.73	20.80	4.14	4.80	5.22	5.60	5.16
Tin in concentrates *(thousand tons)*	104.4	109.9	109.6	108.5	104.1	73.1	72.7	90.7	21.2	21.2	22.3	23.2	[illegible]
Petroleum, crude *(million tons)*	17.59	20.19	34.50	46.00	58.50	63.75	71.37	78.07	18.19	18.84	18.48	19.36	21.38
Salt *(thousand tons)*	5,246	4,692	5,023	5,553	6,810	7,604	6,490	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sugar *(thousand tons)*	4,192	3,979	4,800	4,931	5,131	5,292	5,963	...	1,382	2,744	1,114	...	...
Cotton yarn *(thousand tons)*	1,225	1,351	1,386	1,497	1,597	1,487	1,596	1,698	416	409	415	429	445
Cotton fabrics *(million metres)*	7,545	8,153	8,188	8,889	9,268	8,259	8,441	9,003	2,154	2,126	2,251	2,228	2,342
Jute manufactures *(thousand tons)*	942	1,013	1,145	1,268	1,209	1,255	1,321	1,368	345	340	349	349	331
Paper excluding paper board *(thousand tons)*	1,231	1,367	1,575	1,758	1,967	2,029	2,489	2,844	665	668	693	725	759
Vegetable oils *(thousand tons)*	879	969	1,084	1,150	1,317	1,198	1,200	1,389	300	314	341	354	357
Cement *(million tons)*	14.8	17.7	17.9	21.0	24.5	25.6	29.2	34.7	8.1	8.0	8.7	8.6	9.4
Steel (ingots & metal for castings) *(thousand tons)*	9,234	9,520	11,209	12,957	14,408	14,063	19,249	25,682	5,515	5,979	6,161	6,538	7,004
Tin metal *(thousand tons)*	64.9	74.5	74.5	78.9	74.3	49.2	48.4	77.4	13.8	16.5	18.6	23.2	20.3
Electricity *(thousand million kWh)*	69.0	74.9	82.5	93.0	104.0	109.1	119.6	141.1	31.9	32.3	34.4	37.4	36.9
TRANSPORT[c]													
Railway traffic *(thousand million)*													
Passenger kilometres	158.4	164.4	172.0	183.1	191.1	197.5	205.3	...	51.5	55.0	57.0	...	...
Freight ton-kilometres	101.0	99.5	108.8	118.9	131.7	132.7	139.7	...	36.0	40.0	34.9	...	...
International sea-borne shipping *(million tons)*													
Freight loaded	44.2	49.5	64.6	67.6	76.3	55.5	84.3	...	20.2	22.6	...	...	...
Freight unloaded	65.9	69.0	75.5	88.3	105.5	90.9	107.3	...	29.6	31.4	...	...	...
EXTERNAL TRADE													
Total value *(million US dollars)*													
Exports	7,342	7,650	8,863	9,379	9,939	9,258	10,592	11,667	3,062	2,806	2,900	2,891	3,064
Imports	9,295	8,959	9,671	11,414	13,547	11,021	11,603	13,584	3,154	3,283	3,459	3,433	3,411
Quantum index[d] *(1953=100)*													
Exports	100	110	125	133	143	138	154	171	170	152	158	171	187
Imports	100	106	110	129	145	125	138	169	147	151	158	168	174
Unit value index[d] *(1953=100)*													
Exports	100	99	102	100	99	94	97	97	105	107	108	108	106
Imports	100	96	96	97	101	96	92	92	92	96	96	94	93
Terms of trade[d] *(1953=100)*	100	103	107	103	97	98	106	115	114	112	113	114	115

1. REGIONAL STATISTICAL SERIES *(Cont'd)*
Annual and quarterly figures

	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960			
									IV	I	II	III	IV
EXTERNAL TRADE *(Cont'd)*													
Direction of trade[e] *(million US dollars)*													
Exports to:—													
ECAFE countries	2,590	2,570	2,726	3,028	3,250	2,868	3,065	*3,569*	861	*852*	*861*	*893*	*963*
Western Europe (including U.K.)	1,759	1,789	2,135	2,198	1,120	1,993	2,230	*2,397*	698	*635*	*553*	*566*	*643*
U.K.	744	845	1,004	1,004	922	1,002	1,107	*1,121*	347	*297*	*247*	*247*	*330*
U.S.A.	1,238	1,172	1,530	1,532	1,652	1,630	2,175	*2,244*	574	*570*	*603*	*537*	*534*
Sterling area	2,339	2,691	2,964	2,990	3,191	2,998	3,286	*3,780*	974	*854*	*875*	*935*	*1,116*
Imports from:—													
ECAFE countries	2,835	2,726	3,097	3,491	3,842	3,443	3,626	*4,136*	1,047	*1,041*	*1,032*	*1,007*	*1,056*
Western Europe (including U.K.)	2,221	2,188	2,202	2,590	3,183	2,419	2,615	*2,960*	706	*714*	*796*	*724*	*726*
U.K.	930	902	955	1,133	1,323	1,033	1,093	*1,241*	198	*300*	*327*	*307*	*307*
U.S.A.	1,800	1,813	1,990	2,414	3,371	2,572	2,454	*3,166*	580	*710*	*803*	*829*	*824*
Sterling area	2,682	2,400	2,659	3,076	3,613	2,866	3,195	*3,569*	902	*858*	*914*	*874*	*923*
Export of primary products[f]													
Quantum index *(1953=100)*													
General	100	102	108	109	112	106	109	*111*	119	116	113	108	*108*
Food	100	107	108	115	120	114	118	*122*	132	131	126	116	*115*
Agricultural materials	100	99	109	105	101	99	103	*99*	115	101	101	93	*102*
Mineral products	100	95	100	111	133	112	106	*133*	93	135	129	153	*113*
Unit value index *(1953=100)*													
General	100	100	108	102	102	99	108	*109*	117	108	110	107	*108*
Food	100	105	95	91	93	92	88	*86*	91	82	82	86	*95*
Agricultural materials	100	97	119	111	110	102	125	*132*	140	137	140	130	*121*
Mineral products	100	93	95	101	102	108	104	*95*	111	93	93	95	*102*
Quantity of exports *(thousand tons)*													
Food													
Fish, fresh or simply preserved	153	164	180	173	172	279	232	238	57	69	55	49	64
Rice and rice products	2,654	2,987	3,294	3,244	3,988	3,064	3,442	3,784	892	1,098	1,171	963	552
Sugar	1,755	1,604	1,689	1,632	1,804	1,959	1,757	1,971	361	536	655	283	496
Tea	436	459	409	458	420	457	452	438	148	101	81	117	139
Spices	59	47	80	90	88	74	97	84	31	24	14	19	27
Agricultural materials													
Hides and skins, raw	24	24	22	20	20	18	22	*23*	8	6	7	4	6
Oilseeds, oil nuts & oil kernels	1,017	1,219	1,232	1,416	1,396	1,092	1,001	1,184	360	264	300	337	285
Rubber, natural	1,611	1,688	1,782	1,699	1,737	1,689	1,929	*1,729*	*513*	442	416	409	*461*
Wood and lumber	1,481	1,732	2,023	2,251	2,359	3,321	4,003	4,265	1,021	936	1,244	950	1,135
Cotton, raw	379	222	320	265	204	223	162	*165*	*25*	*52*	*58*	*30*	*24*
Jute, raw	982	892	981	958	785	906	809	757	290	239	182	124	211
Hemp, raw	132	122	135	143	141	109	113	111	28	36	25	25	29
Vegetable oils, not essential	404	499	602	515	450	417	392	362	119	75	74	107	105
Mineral products													
Iron ore	3,728	3,540	4,399	5,636	6,631	5,877	7,661	*10,420*	1,740	1,950	2,296	3,703	*2,267*
Tin ore and concentrates	45	45	44	45	42	27	30	40	9	10	9	11	9
Manganese ore	1,593	1,006	936	712	1,742	976	986	1,160	203	226	360	320	254
Coal	2,201	2,063	1,562	1,940	1,655	1,800	1,556	1,635	375	443	335	362	495
Crude petroleum	6,963	7,083	8,367	10,027	12,408	12,478	9,825	11,993	2,093	3,485	2,964	3,225	2,319
GOLD AND FOREIGN EXCHANGE ASSETS[g,r] *(end of period, million US dollars)*	5,107	4,944	5,367	5,170	4,035	5,280	5,141	*5,749*	5,141	5,252	5,347	5,509	*5,749*

GENERAL NOTES: In general, the regional statistical series cover the countries of the ECAFE region except mainland China, Nepal and, in most cases, Afghanistan and Iran; in some cases, other countries have also been omitted because of lack of data. Except in the case of mainland China, countries omitted from the regional series are, from the point of view of the series, usually less important. To ensure comparability, the countries included in different periods for each series are the same.

a. Crop year except rubber, copra and tea beginning from the year stated. FAO source except rubber and tea for which the International Rubber Study Group and the International Tea Committee figures are used respectively.

b. This index compiled by the United Nations Statistical Office, covers Afghanistan, Brunei, Burma, Ceylon, China:Taiwan, Federation of Malaya and Singapore, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Republic of Korea, Pakistan, Philippines, Sarawak, Thailand and Republic of Viet-Nam. For more detailed statistics and explanatory notes see United Nations *Monthly Bulletin of Statistics.*

c. For countries covered see table 5 below.

d. Based on quantum and unit value indexes of exports and imports, compiled by governments of Burma, Ceylon, China: Taiwan, Federation of Malaya and Singapore, India, Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea (since 1957), Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand and Republic of Viet-Nam. (Quantum indexes for Indonesia, Korea and Pakistan are derived from unit value indexes.) These national indexes are combined to form the regional index with the dollar values of exports and imports in the base year 1953 as weights. Exports and imports of the countries included in the index account for 89 and 90 per cent of total exports and imports of the region respectively, excluding Afghanistan, mainland China, Iran and Nepal, in the base year. Intra-regional trade is not deducted.

e. For countries covered see table 7 below. Prior to 1955, including data on Customs Union of Cambodia-Laos-Viet-Nam.

f. Exports of 18 primary products and food from 20 countries and territories (excluding Afghanistan, mainland China and Nepal) are included in the index. To minimize the effect of transit trade, only export of domestic produce is included for Hong Kong and net export of rubber is used for Singapore and Federation of Malaya. The quantity of exports of each item is totalled for 20 countries and territories and relatives have been then weighted by the total value of exports of each commodity in 20 countries and territories in terms of United States dollars in 1953 to form the quantum index. The unit value index is obtained by dividing the index of total value of exports in United States dollars by the quantum index. The commodities included in the index account for 42 per cent of the total value of exports from the 20 countries. (If Hong Kong and Japan are excluded, the percentage is increased to 54.)

g. Includes Burma, Ceylon, China:Taiwan, Federation of Malaya and Singapore, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Republic of Korea, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand and Republic of Viet-Nam. Figures prior to 1955 exclude Viet-Nam.

2. INDEX NUMBER OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

1953=100[a]

	Weight	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
								IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
CHINA (Taiwan)														
Industrial production[b] .	100.0	119	125	142	153	173	197	208	198	214	220	239	248	199
Mining and quarrying .	10.5	114	120	134	144	155	174	171	168	174	162	190	220	130
Coal	7.4	99	106	122	133	149	166	164	153	170	158	182	219	117
Manufacturing[b] . . .	76.6	120	125	143	153	175	200	219	208	224	235	253	261	215
Food[b]	19.0	101	104	126	121	121	137	192	185	169	261	295	285	254
Textiles	17.8	122	115	128	124	152	170	171	156	173	170	180	198	157
Chemicals . . .	9.5	120	134	158	180	219	256	246	217	258	248	300	293	246
Construction of buildings	1.1	145	104	118	177	118	134	107	119	163	94	161	79	162
Public utilities . . .	11.9	123	135	149	162	182	207	200	185	207	215	219	222	187
Electricity . . .	7.6	126	144	163	184	205	232	225	204	235	242	247	249	202
INDIA[c]														
Industrial production . .	100.0	116	126	130	132	144	161	147	160	153	162	169	180	...
Mining	7.2	107	110	122	128	136	153	132	153	156	147	160	178	...
Manufacturing . . .	90.7	116	126	130	131	143	160	146	159	150	160	167	178	...
Sugar	4.3	123	144	160	152	161	198	167	440	71	15	219	495	...
Tea	5.9	110	110	111	118	116	114	140	18	83	209	140	22	...
Textiles	48.0	106	112	109	105	107	...	104	107	111	115	...	...	...
Chemicals . . .	4.2	122	132	140	159	175	...	176	185	192	195	...	...	...
Basic metal industries	8.0	119	124	126	128	169	...	181	197	201	245	...	...	...
Metal products[d] . .	4.6	168	200	222	233	264	...	262	246	262	277	...	...	...
Transport equipment	2.9	171	236	246	229	289	...	318	367	333	401	...	...	...
Electricity	2.1	128	145	163	185	220	248	224	227	251	254	252	268	...
Industrial production (seasonally adjusted) .	.	.	.	.	.	.	...	152	158	153	163	...	...	...
JAPAN														
Industrial production . .	100	117	144	167	168	208	261	229	248	254	263	281	271	294
Manufacturing and mining	92.8	117	143	169	169	210	266	232	252	258	267	285	275	300
Mining	7.2	97	107	118	114	113	124	117	119	120	123	133	128	128
Manufacturing . .	85.6	119	147	174	175	220	280	244	265	272	281	301	290	318
Food	11.5	115	122	128	135	142	148	120	220	126	127	118	156	239
Textiles . . .	15.0	121	144	159	143	167	197	184	186	197	199	205	189	202
Chemicals . . .	10.7	132	159	187	194	222	259	237	246	258	258	272	268	263
Ferrous metals .	9.0	117	143	162	153	201	258	230	233	258	260	283	271	275
Machinery . . .	17.0	114	166	230	247	354	506	417	439	491	525	571	539	597
Public utilities . . .	7.2	114	131	146	155	177	208	190	135	205	210	223	228	214
KOREA, Republic of (1954=100)														
Industrial production . .	100.0	120	146	169	186	213	233	230	219	230	242	240	229	...
Mining	12.8	125	162	218	229	318	418	385	411	407	419	434	442	...
Coal	9.3	147	204	275	300	465	602	589	601	587	588	630	639	...
Manufacturing . . .	80.1	119	144	162	180	200	213	210	197	212	224	220	206	...
Food	8.1	128	183	197	233	215	227	226	184	216	286	223	218	...
Textiles	21.1	123	143	175	180	187	181	186	177	184	182	182	168	...
Electricity	7.1	98	124	147	168	187	189	203	192	184	193	187	193	...
Industrial production (seasonally adjusted) .	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	227	235	225	237	237	...	...
PAKISTAN														
Industrial production . .	...	161	182	192	*215*	*241*	*260*	*254*	*260*	*249*	*253*	*279*	...	...
Mining	...	107	125	130	*145*	*145*	*171*	*162*	*160*	*170*	*166*	*188*	...	...
Manufacturing . . .	...	167	189	200	*222*	*250*	*269*	*263*	*270*	*256*	*261*	*288*	...	...
PHILIPPINES														
Mining	.	102	113	126	125	135	129	125	123	131	132	130	...	...
Manufacturing . . .	.	127	147	158	170	185	190	183	194	189	184	193	...	...

a. Original base: *China (Taiwan)*, 1954; *India*, 1951; *Japan*, 1955; *Republic of Korea*, 1958; *Pakistan*, 1950; *Philippines*, 1955.

b. Sugar production is excluded from the monthly and quarterly index but included in the annual index. Weights relate to annual index.

c. Quarterly figures relate to the mid-month of each quarter.

d. General engineering and electrical engineering including general machinery and electrical machines, apparatus, appliances and supplies.

3. PRODUCTION OF SELECTED COMMODITIES

Monthly averages or calendar months

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
TEA													
Ceylon	14.4	14.2	15.0	15.6	15.6	16.4	15.9	16.9	19.1	13.7	16.0	15.5	13.9
China: Taiwan	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.7	1.2	2.7	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.1	0.7	2.0
India	25.3	25.2	25.4	27.0	26.7	26.2	30.5	4.6	24.4	44.4	31.4	5.1	...
Indonesia	3.6	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.7	4.1	3.5	4.0	3.4	4.1	3.9	...
Pakistan	2.0	2.1	1.8	2.2	2.3	1.6	2.7	0.2	0.9	2.8	2.6	0.2	...
NATURAL RUBBER[a]													
Cambodia	2.3	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.9	3.1	4.1	1.9	2.9	3.4	4.3	4.0	1.4
Ceylon	7.9	8.1	8.3	8.5	7.8	8.2	10.7	8.4	7.2	7.3	9.9	10.4	5.5
Fed. of Malaya & Singapore	54.1	53.1	54.1	56.2	59.1	60.2	63.2	59.1	54.9	63.4	63.3	68.6	58.7
India	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.8	1.6	1.7	2.2	2.9	2.5	1.2
Indonesia	62.1	58.1	58.0	52.0	61.1	50.4	70.3	49.8	51.6	45.1	54.6	35.5	...
Sarawak	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.7	4.2	4.1	4.1	5 3	4.5	2.9	1.8	4.0
Thailand	11.0	11.3	11.3	11.6	14.4	14.2	13.9	16.1	12.3	12.9	15.2	10.7	17.0
Viet-Nam, Republic of	5.5	5.9	5.8	6.0	6.3	6.5	9.0	2.9	6.9	7.2	9.1	8.9	...
COAL													
China: Taiwan	197	211	243	265	297	330	325	304	339	314	363	437	232
Federation of Malaya[b]	17	15	13	6	6	...	8	2	—	—	—	—	—
India	3,237	3,339	3,683	3,839	3,982	4,395	3,959	4,327	4,361	4,158	4,692	5,137	...
Indonesia	68	69	60	51	53	...	60	54	59	57	...	...	...
Iran*	20	16	15	16	16	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Japan	3,535	3,880	4,311	4,139	3,938	4,255	4,040	4,098	4,138	4,169	4,607	4,515	4,446
Korea, Republic of	109	151	203	223	345	446	436	446	435	435	467	474	486
Pakistan[c]	45	55	44	51	61	65	59	64	68	56	72	...	...
Philippines	11	13	16	9	12	12	13	14	11	15	10	...	...
Viet-Nam, Republic of	—	—	1.0	1.7	1.7	2.3	1.8	1.3	2.1	3.2	2.6	...	...
NATURAL GAS *(million cubic metres)*													
Brunei[d]	98.1	119.0	133.8	133.5	148.2	135.0	147.7	135.1	138.4	133.6	132.0	...	...
China: Taiwan	2.16	2.27	2.40	2.18	2.19	2.12	2.66	1.76	2.28	2.34	2.10	2.28	2.71
Indonesia[d]	159.0	170.0	181.0	174.0	186.0	...	185.6	193.0	198.0	209.6	...	...	...
Japan	13.0	14.7	20.6	30.7	42.2	61.7	47.4	58.0	54.9	59.8	74.3	76.3	73.7
Pakistan	...	24.6	36.2	45.6	52.8	66.9	57.3	47.7	69.2	73.5	77.1	...	...
PETROLEUM, CRUDE[e]													
Brunei	438	470	450	434	450	381	437	403	381	372	369	...	...
Burma	18	19	33	39	44	46	46	45	42	49	47	46	37
China: Taiwan	0.28	0.25	0.21	0.18	0.15	0.17	0.19	0.14	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.18	0.21
India	28	32	36	35	37	37	39	38	37	35	40	...	...
Indonesia	982	1,061	1,289	1,342	1,518	...	1,600	1,631	1,751	1,720	...	...	...
Iran[f]	1,359	2,195	2,999	3,401	3,837	4,267	...	4,134	3,916	4,238	4,822	4,680	*4,402*
Japan	26	26	27	31	34	44	38	39	41	44	51	45	49
Pakistan	23	24	25	25	26	...	28	24	24	24	...	...	...
Sarawak	6	6	6	5	5	...	5	5	5	5	...	...	...
IRON ORE[g]													
Federation of Malaya	124	207	252	237	318	478	316	375	489	588	458	507	460
Hong Kong	10	10	8	9	10	10	11	10	9	10	10	11	9
India	361	359	391	483	656	...	746	888	903	871	867	957	877
Japan[h]	126	159	187	167	207	237	233	211	238	259	242	200	209
Korea, Republic of	2	5	15	22	23	33	19	26	26	37	42	53	36
Pakistan	—	0.6	2.0	0.7	0.2	...	—	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines	119	120	112	92	103	95	81	93	97	98	91	50	88
TIN CONCENTRATES *(tons)*													
Burma	94	67	59	*102*	*102*	*122*	*102*	*122*	*122*	*122*	*122*	*122*	*122*
China: Mainland	*1,016*	*1,186*	*1,354*	*1,524*	*1,778*	*2,030*	*1,778*	*2,030*	*2,030*	*2,030*	*2,030*	*2,030*	*2,030*
Federation of Malaya	5,186	5,274	5,020	3,256	3,177	4,401	3,740	4,150	4,322	4,429	4,702	4,638	4,130
Indonesia	2,825	2,545	2,347	1,968	1,830	1,914	2,119	1,626	1,910	2,075	2,045	1,220	1,355
Japan	76	79	80	94	83	*74*	91	75	81	72	67	84	72
Laos	21	20	23	26	25	*31*	25	*31*	*31*	*31*	*31*	*31*	*31*
Thailand	933	1,057	1,145	654	820	1,023	976	1,064	1,000	994	1,023	1,170	1,028
SALT													
Burma	8.4	7.2	9.7	9.2	9.3	12.3	10.3	11.7	15.7	11.1	10.8	...	...
China: Taiwan	35.1	25.4	32.3	36.6	35.8	37.8	40.8	55.2	31.8	15.5	48.7	43.7	36.8
India	252.2	276.5	307.0	350.1	264.9	286.3	58.8	162.1	594.3	246.5	142.4	137.7	...
Indonesia	3.8	9.1	28.9	19.6	26.2	...	87.1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Japan[i]	46.1	52.3	69.3	88.2	97.1	73.5	94.1	77.3	74.9	75.8	65.9	50.9	61.1
Korea, Republic of	29.5	16.4	30.8	36.4	32.5	33.3	34.7	0.3	47.1	64.9	20.8	0.6	—
Pakistan	33.8	32.8	38.3	29.9	24.0	...	28.6	34.2	37.0	...	...	...	...
Philippines	6.7	5.3	8.6	11.6	14.5	7.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand	19.7	20.6	21.9	35.6	38.3	...	*38.3*	*27.5*	*27.5*	*27.5*	...	...	...
Viet-Nam, Republic of	6.4	5.0	6.6	5.1	5.1	...	1.8	...	...	...	...	...	...

3. PRODUCTION OF SELECTED COMMODITIES *(Cont'd)*

Monthly averages or calendar months — *Thousand tons*

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
SUGAR[j]													
Afghanistan	0.50	0.40	0.40	0.39	0.38	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Burma	1.50	1.58	2.68	3.40	3.31	3.42	2.13	9.76	1.12	—	2.80	9.40	...
China: Taiwan	66.9	64.6	76.5	72.2	74.0	70.5	67.4	183.0	7.7	—	91.2	223.5	191.5
India	136.8	165.1	170.0	165.7	176.3	215.9	213.4	479.4	116.7	12.5	255.0	541.0	...
Indonesia	71.4	65.5	69.0	64.5	71.3	56.3	21.1	—	71.6	146.7	6.7	—	...
Iran	6.9	6.9	6.8	9.2	9.2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Korea, Republic of	3.2	5.2	2.6	4.3	5.0	5.3	5.7	4.7	4.4	6.5	5.7	4.5	4.2
Pakistan	8.0	7.4	9.4	13.8	14.2	12.3	12.1	28.0	8.2	0.2	12.8	32.9	...
Philippines	103.7	97.0	85.8	100.6	122.6	112.9	141.2	225.1	68.6	18.6	139.4	...	...
Thailand	3.1	3.3	4.2	6.1	*6.7*	*9.2*	*6.7*	*9.2*	*9.2*	*9.2*	*9.2*	...	...
Viet-Nam, Republic of	0.13	0.17	0.09	0.41	2.74	...	2.93	4.43	5.73	5.03	...	...	...
COTTON YARN													
Burma	0.12	0.12	0.14	0.20	0.30	0.32	0.38	0.30	0.29	0.33	0.34	0.32	0.32
China: Taiwan	2.1	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.6	3.4	2.8	2.8	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.8	2.8
Hong Kong	3.5	3.8	4.0	4.4	5.2	6.6	5.7	5.6	6.2	6.7	7.7	...	...
India	61.6	63.2	67.3	63.7	65.0	65.7	67.1	63.9	63.2	67.1	68.3	70.3	...
Japan	34.9	41.1	43.1	36.6	39.7	46.0	43.6	44.1	46.7	46.2	47.2	43.9	48.6
Korea, Republic of	2.2	2.6	3.4	3.7	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.3	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.1
Pakistan	10.4	11.4	12.0	13.0	14.6	15.4	15.3	15.4	14.8	14.9	16.8	...	...
Philippines	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.06	*0.09*	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.06	...
COTTON FABRICS (*Mn metres*)													
Ceylon (*Mn sq. metres*)	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	...	...
China: Taiwan	13.6	11.6	13.0	12.2	13.0	14.7	13.4	13.3	14.8	15.2	15.4	14.9	13.7
India	388	404	405	375	375	385	378	375	377	394	392	400	373
Indonesia	4.2	4.4	4.7	4.6	3.4	...	3.7	4.9	5.2	5.9	...	...	...
Japan (*Mn sq. metres*)	210	242	268	218	230	268	245	252	270	270	281	268	284
Korea, Republic of (*Mn sq. metres*)	8.4	10.2	13.8	10.4	11.0	10.5	10.5	10.3	11.0	10.4	10.3	...	...
Pakistan	34.5	38.1	40.2	43.9	47.2	49.3	47.5	48.2	45.4	50.3	53.3	...	...
Philippines	0.9	1.4	1.2	0.9	0.8	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.4
Thailand	3.1	4.4	4.1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
JUTE MANUFACTURES													
China: Taiwan (Gunny bags, *Mn pieces*)	0.90	1.05	1.01	0.73	1.41	1.25	1.76	1.47	1.53	1.17	0.82	1.45	1.16
India	87.0	92.5	87.2	89.9	89.0	90.4	91.2	89.4	92.0	91.6	88.5	87.6	78.6
Pakistan	7.5	12.1	12.6	14.5	19.0	22.4	21.8	22.4	22.7	23.6	21.0	21.7	19.0
Thailand (Gunny bags, *Mn pieces*)	0.28	0.36	0.40	0.45	*0.47*	...	*0.47*	...	...	...	...	...	...
PAPER[k]													
China: Taiwan	2.8	3.6	5.0	6.0	7.1	8.1	7.7	7.5	8.3	7.9	8.8	8.4	7.8
India	10.1	10.4	10.7	13.1	15.0	*18.0*	17.5	18.0	17.4	*18.0*	*18.5*	...	...
Japan	116.1	129.6	145.7	147.4	181.9	206.9	193.3	193.1	201.8	211.5	221.3	216.8	218.8
Korea, Republic of	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.0	1.8	2.2	2.1	2.3	1.9	2.1	2.7	2.8	2.5
Pakistan	1.1	1.4	1.7	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.1	1.6	1.5	2.0	1.8	1.9	2.0
Thailand	0.17	0.25	0.23	*0.23*	*0.22*	...	*0.22*	...	...	...	...	...	...
VEGETABLE OILS													
China: Taiwan: Edible oil	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.0	0.9	2.3	1.9	1.4	1.7
Federation of Malaya: Coconut oil	8.0	9.2	8.2	6.7	5.7	6.1	6.0	5.5	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.1	5.5
Palm oil	4.8	4.7	5.0	6.0	6.1	7.4	6.1	7.0	8.1	7.5	7.1	6.1	5.7
India: Edible oil (Vanaspati)	22.1	21.6	25.5	25.0	26.8	28.1	28.3	32.9	28.9	24.9	25.8	34.1	...
Indonesia: Palm oil	13.8	13.7	13.4	12.3	11.5	11.7	11.9	10.0	11.7	13.5	11.8	9.9	...
Japan: Coconut oil	2.3	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.8	3.9	3.4	3.4	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.4
Others	13.0	15.1	16.3	19.9	20.6	22.0	19.3	21.8	20.6	22.4	23.3	21.0	20.6
Pakistan: Vegetable oil	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.7	2.3	2.9	2.4	2.5	2.9	2.5	3.7	4.0	...
Philippines: Coconut oil	13.3	*17.7*	27.8	19.1	15.8	24.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Singapore: Coconut oil	2.8	3.4	4.1	2.6	1.7	2.1	2.3	1.8	1.9	2.1	2.5	2.6	2.1
SUPERHOSPHATES[m]													
China: Taiwan	6.7	8.4	8.6	8.7	9.9	10.1	10.1	7.7	10.6	10.8	11.3	11.7	10.0
India	6.3	6.9	12.0	14.0	21.1	...	24.0	31.5	27.7	24.7	...	...	...
Japan	149.6	171.5	155.3	146.5	153.9	179.1	154.0	189.8	188.2	155.7	182.8	194.6	183.8
Pakistan	...	...	...	0.09	0.13	...	0.11	0.16	—	...	...	...	...
AMMONIUM SULPHATE													
China: Taiwan	0.4	0.6	1.3	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	2.1	2.2	2.6
India	33.3	32.9	32.1	32.5	32.9	32.4	32.0	32.4	29.7	32.2	35.4	36.0	...
Japan	177.4	193.6	206.7	217.5	219.5	202.0	194.6	205.4	198.0	205.3	199.3	201.3	119.2
Pakistan	...	...	...	1.7	3.6	...	3.5	4.1	4.0	...	...	...	...

3. PRODUCTION OF SELECTED COMMODITIES *(Cont'd)*

Monthly averages or calendar months

PRODUCTION

Thousand tons

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
PETROLEUM PRODUCTS[n]													
Burma	10.7	11.4	18.2	25.0	27.6	31.0	29.4	32.1	29.5	30.5	31.7	25.9	...
China: Taiwan *(thousand Kilolitres)*	51.0	52.5	55.5	56.4	67.1	79.5	64.5	73.9	75.1	75.3	96.2	90.8	58.4
India	252.0	324.2	370.7	397.7	429.4	479.8	466.2	451.6	480.2	494.0	493.4	...	...
Indonesia	863.9	859.0	911.1	847.8	917.2	...	923.0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran	606.2	919.2	1,251.7	1,302.9	1,307.4	1,439.0	1,374.7	1,405.0	1,368.0	1,524.0	1,459.0	1,105.4	1,459.0
Japan *(thousand Kilolitres)*	717.8	984.1	1,212.6	1,346.5	1,820.9	2,571.9	2,216.6	2,406.0	2,472.7	2,402.2	3,006.9	3,072.3	2,833.1
Sarawak	192.1	206.8	195.8	196.4	199.5	...	203.2	199.1	195.1	202.2	...	...	...
Pakistan	6.3	7.0	7.2	7.4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines	49.8	63.0	71.7	95.2	100.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
CEMENT													
Burma	5.0	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.5	3.4	4.7	3.4	3.5	3.2	4.4
Ceylon	7.1	7.1	4.1	6.7	7.9	7.2	8.0	7.8	5.2	8.2	7.7	...	...
China: Taiwan	49.2	49.2	50.3	84.6	89.0	98.6	87.2	96.3	95.5	95.4	107.2	136.2	127.2
Federation of Malaya	9.1	8.7	9.5	9.2	16.0	23.9	20.9	19.2	23.0	26.1	27.2	28.8	26.6
Hong Kong	9.7	10.1	8.7	12.7	11.8	12.5	12.0	13.0	12.1	10.8	14.1	17.6	13.7
India	379.9	417.2	474.3	513.6	576.7	652.6	619.2	655.4	654.1	614.3	686.7	715.0	667.0
Iran	11.0	18.7	26.1	34.2	44.4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Japan	879.7	1,085.3	1,264.7	1,249.0	1,439.0	1,878.0	1,673.0	1,672.0	1,869.0	1,907.3	2,064.0	1,602.0	1,876.0
Korea, Republic of	4.7	3.8	7.7	24.6	29.8	35.9	35.4	34.4	34.8	36.7	37.7	39.0	41.3
Pakistan	57.7	65.4	91.3	90.8	82.8	94.8	79.9	91.8	99.5	88.7	99.2	...	...
Philippines	34.1	37.2	42.6	53.5	60.8	66.2	55.9	65.5	65.5	64.0	70.0	...	...
Thailand	32.2	33.1	33.5	38.0	40.1	36.6	38.8	39.5	38.8	34.1	34.1	33.7	43.4
STEEL (ingots and metal for castings)													
China: Taiwan	4.8	6.0	7.4	8.9	13.2	16.7	17.5	15.1	16.5	17.4	18.0	18.9	13.4
India	144.3	147.1	145.2	153.5	206.0	271.0	235.7	263.2	247.9	264.3	308.0	...	...
Japan	784.0	925.5	1,047.5	1,009.8	1,385.7	1,844.8	1,588.7	1,714.9	1,788.8	1,870.8	2,015.7	1,996.0	2,001.0
Korea, Republic of	...	...	1.4	1.6	3.2	4.2	3.2	5.0	3.2	4.8	3.7	—	2.4
Pakistan	0.9	0.9	1.4	0.8	0.8	0.6	1.0	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.7
TIN METAL *(tons)*													
China: Mainland	*1,016*	*1,186*	*1,354*	*1,524*	*1,778*	*2,030*	*1,778*	*2,030*	*2,030*	*2,030*	*2,030*	*2,030*	*2,030*
Fed. of Malaya & Singapore	5,980	6,203	6,036	3,838	3,872	6,446	4,479	5,358	6,052	7,593	6,781	7,343	4,948
Indonesia	150	25	27	*51*	*135*	*152*	*135*	*152*	*152*	*152*	*152*	*152*	*152*
Japan	79	94	107	112	111	*107*	*72*	*85*	*109*	114	*119*	*102*	*102*
ELECTRICITY[p] *(million kWh)*													
Afghanistan[q]	2.87	2.97	4.10	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Brunei[q]	0.18	0.28	0.41	0.55	0.68	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Burma	7.7	9.3	12.3	15.1	17.6	...	19.9	19.5	20.6	...	...	...	...
Cambodia	2.31	2.75	3.16	3.60	4.05	4.60	4.24	4.41	4.61	4.90	4.50	...	...
Ceylon	15	18	17	20	22	*25*	23	23	25	26	*26*	...	...
China: Taiwan	164	187	213	237	268	302	294	266	306	315	322	324	263
Federation of Malaya[q]	79	84	89	74	77	89	85	92	97	102	106	108	...
Hong Kong	47	54	62	68	79	93	83	81	90	103	97	99	87
India	716	803	906	1,031	1,213	1,361	1,267	1,287	1,364	1,382	1,406	1,462	1,361
Indonesia	72	75	82	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran*[q]	48	50	52	54	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Japan[q]	5,433	6,011	6,476	6,656	7,939	9,241	8,500	8,372	9,202	9,456	9,936	9,898	...
Korea, Republic of	73	93	110	126	141	141	152	144	138	145	140	145	129
Laos	0.16	0.23	0.28	0.29	0.47	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan	51	64	78	106	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines (Manila)	65	77	93	107	125	142	131	134	139	146	149	149	142
Singapore	31	36	41	47	51	55	53	52	54	56	57	58	...
Thailand (Bangkok)[s]	16	18	22	23	27	...	29	29	*29*	30	...	...	...
Viet-Nam, Republic of	17	18	18	20	22	24	23	23	24	25	24	...	...

a. Including latex. b. Lignite. c. Including lignite.

d. Total production, including gas for repressuring and gas wasted.

e. Specific gravity: *Brunei, Burma, India, Iran, Pakistan* and *Sarawak*, 0.84; *China (Taiwan)*, 0.89; *Indonesia*, 0.85; *Japan*, 0.90.

f. Beginning 1960, figures approximately 98%.

g. Approximate metal content of ores as follows: *Federation of Malaya*, 60%; *Hong Kong*, 45%; *India*, 65%; *Japan* and the *Philippines*, 55%; *Korea*, 45-57%.

h. Including iron sand.

i. Production in government licensed plants only.

j. Annual figures relate to crop year for the Philippines and Thailand, but calendar year for other countries.

k. Paper excluding paper board: *India*, printing and writing; *Japan*, foreign style; *Korea*, newsprint; *Pakistan*, printing other than newsprint and writing.

m. 16% P_2O_5 content.

n. Comprising motor spirit, kerosene and diesel oil for Burma; gasoline, diesel oil, kerosene and fuel oil for China (Taiwan); motor spirit, aviation spirit, kerosene, heavy oil, wax and paraffin, asphalt and cutback for Indonesia; motor spirit, kerosene, distillate fuel oils and residual fuel oil for Sarawak, and Philippines; motor spirit and kerosene for Pakistan; all products for other countries.

p. Gross production by enterprises generating primarily for public use.

q. Including production by industrial establishments generating primarily for own use.

s. Consumption of electricity; Bangkok Electric Works and Sam Sen Power Station.

4. CONSTRUCTION — NEW BUILDING

Monthly averages or calendar months

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
Ceylon: completed[a]													
(Floor area—*thousand sq metres*)													
Residential	6.72	6.49	5.97	1.88	3.95	...	4.67	3.79	5.02	...	...	...	...
Non-residential	2.02	2.20	2.54	1.46	3.08	...	3.13	2.44	2.48	...	...	...	...
China: Taiwan: completed													
(Floor area—*thousand sq metres*)													
Public	6.15	4.71	5.68	8.41	6.26	9.52	6.71	9.72	14.22	4.04	10.11	4.62	...
Private	32.73	23.55	26.67	35.85	24.13	25.07	20.96	20.93	27.28	20.28	31.79	15.95	...
Hong Kong: completed													
(Cost—*thousand Hong Kong dollars*)													
Residential	8,902	8,654	10,267	10,489	13,982	20,916	18,243	23,456	23,812	22,662	13,735	25,345	8,440
Industrial	862	815	1,016	2,330	1,488	2,277	1,688	2,571	3,388	1,931	1,219	4,201	5,624
Commercial	336	1,438	1,204	2,438	1,279	5,586	3,950	3,597	1,833	14,961	1,955	1,410	—
Others	1,845	2,197	1,696	4,847	1,746	3,020	2,820	1,934	4,806	2,967	2,374	6,437	1,792
Japan: started													
(Floor area—*thousand sq metres*)													
Residential	1,454	1,752	1,870	1,933	2,145	2,415	2,362	1,847	2,599	2,707	2,508	...	...
Non-residential	1,328	1,665	1,775	1,593	2,093	2,708	2,512	2,092	2,700	2,943	3,098	...	...
Korea, Republic of: permits issued													
(Floor area—*thousand sq metres*)													
Residential	13[b]	27	22	37	60	53	57	27	76	72	37	6	11
Non-residential	53[b]	65	66	67	83	62	74	56	86	59	48	25	28
Philippines:[c] **permits issued**													
(Value—*thousand pesos*)													
Residential	1,295	1,596	1,732	1,807	1,547	1,378	1,321	970	1,599	1,435	1,507	2,117	1,945
Non-residential	1,857	2,298	3,122	2,193	3,364	2,391	3,955	2,886	3,214	2,107	1,358	4,830	2,704
Singapore: completed (*Number of dwelling units*)													
Public[d]	279	184	124	340	127	142	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Private[e]	200	186	156	145	134	176	48	61	49	38	26	54	6
Thailand:[f] **permits issued** (*Number of buildings*)													
Residential	244	201	204	226	163	204	158	213	261	201	140	195	245
Non-residential	72	64	44	27	21	29	28	31	32	29	24	36	44
Viet-Nam,[g] **Republic of**													
(Floor area—*thousand sq metres*)													
Apartments	6.36	7.10	4.41	7.99	10.21	...	15.32	9.22	7.19	...	10.07	5.92	8.20
Houses	5.10	3.35	3.92	5.23	8.11	...	6.85	16.51	11.28	...	8.52	14.90	7.56
Others	2.10	2.82	1.99	2.80	4.20	...	3.16	3.66	4.68	...	4.73	2.75	0.96

a. Excluding particulars of buildings under building schemes.
b. December.
c. Manila only.
d. Comprising buildings erected by or on behalf of Public Works Department, Housing and Development Board and City Council.
e. Monthly and quarterly figures exclude buildings erected in city area which are not available.
f. Bangkok only.
g. Saigon-Cholon only.

5. VOLUME OF TRAFFIC: RAILWAYS, SEA-BORNE SHIPPING AND CIVIL AVIATION

Monthly averages or calendar months

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
RAILWAYS[a]													
Passenger-kilometres (*million*)													
Burma†	66	70	79	89	108	...	126	121	144	*127*	*152*	...	...
Cambodia	5	6	7	6	6	...	6	7	8	7	...	...	...
Ceylon†	115	123	127	118	*136*	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
China: Taiwan	211	237	287	308	308	300	311	324	297	272	308	*281*	354
Hong Kong	7	9	10	9	11	13	12	14	14	11	13	10	13
Fed. of Malaya and Singapore	49	50	52	49	50	...	50	52	49	49	...	47	...
India‡	5,039	5,469	5,584	5,617	5,885	*6,216*	5,680	6,346	6,474	5,818	6,046	6,265	...
Indonesia	421	388	395	460	552	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran	39	37	72	128	*166*	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Japan‡	7,603	8,173	8,437	8,851	9,516	*10,150*	9,430	9,758	10,187	10,424	10,230	10,637	9,274
Korea, Republic of	309	337	286	348	372	411	397	390	391	408	456	402	...
North Borneo	0.92	1.25	1.33	1.33	1.38	1.47	1.31	1.49	1.51	1.51	1.36	1.48	1.56
Pakistan‡	788	860	901	905	960	...	919	985	...	984	987	982	...
Philippinesø	37	43	49	58	62	67	67	64	78	57	71	...	...
Thailand	167	155	164	164	154	196	147	217	222	164	181	...	...
Viet-Nam, Republic of	‖ 31	32	37	36	43	45	48	50	48	41	41	42	...
Freight ton-kilometres (*million*)													
Burma†	53	51	52	52	59	...	55	71	70	62	*51*	...	...
Cambodia	2	4	5	5	7	...	6	8	6	8	...	...	...
Ceylon†	22	24	25	22	25	...	28	24	25	26	...	...	...
China: Taiwan[b]	137	142	159	158	155	...	170	170	172	141	*113*	...	...
Fed. of Malaya and Singapore	33	37	36	32	46	59	55	60	59	60	55	...	...
Hong Kong	0.51	0.65	0.57	0.66	0.75	0.99	1.02	0.74	0.84	1.11	1.29	0.69	0.56
India‡	4,613	5,203	5,963	6,158	6,552	*6,182*	6,319	7,821	5,981	6,565	7,044	7,900	...
Indonesia	88	87	87	89	87	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran	104	113	125	121	161	...	167	167	170	163	...	...	...
Japan‡	3,500	3,859	3,971	3,727	4,088	*4,381*	4,431	4,115	4,362	4,283	4,762	3,821	4,125
Korea, Republic of	156	169	197	204	234	254	261	245	254	260	256	255	...
North Borneo	0.25	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.31	0.33	0.32	0.29	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.34	0.26
Pakistan‡	469	529	557	596	613	...	608	695	...	589	706	728	...
Philippinesø	13	12	13	17	15	17	15	16	19	17	17	...	...
Thailand	65	76	85	91	100	106	97	115	113	97	99	127	120
Viet-Nam, Republic of	‖ 7	5	7	7	10	13	12	13	15	14	9	17	...

5. VOLUME OF TRAFFIC: RAILWAYS, SEA-BORNE SHIPPING AND CIVIL AVIATION *(Cont'd)*

Monthly averages or calendar months

		1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
								IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
INTERNATIONAL SEA-BORNE SHIPPING														
Freight loaded (L) and unloaded (U) in external trade *(thousand tons)*														
Burma†	L	145	168	201	220	217	...	171	226	243	173	...	...	...
	U	73	78	110	145	134	...	99	106	92	78	...	...	...
Brunei	L	5	4	3	2	3	4	...	3	6	4	3	...	...
	U	14	14	13	13	5	8	...	7	8	9	8	...	...
Ceylon	L	88	82	83	69	66	61	77	59	65	69	51	72	145
	U	191	205	268	280	321	337	410	409	325	354	260	458	518
China: Taiwan	L	106	104	111	149	147	160	133	160	160	120	201	...	...
	U	155	177	193	189	203	234	190	213	220	265	237	...	...
Fed. of Malaya	L	226	284	310	258	345	*452*	308	290	612	551	*350*	...	...
	U	231	241	235	221	226	*272*	243	243	270	285	*289*	...	...
Hong Kong	L	141	162	143	164	166	180	190	188	178	181	173	198	153
	U	347	386	426	443	458	494	494	498	472	508	497	470	455
Indonesia	L	1,040	1,096	1,500	1,412	1,067	1,339	642	1,407	1,279	1,305	1,367	...	...
	U	389	488	526	292	292	261	263	254	218	225	353	...	...
Iran*[c]	L	1,199	1,181	1,686	...	2,363	...	2,404	2,394	2,392	2,441	...	...	...
	U	89	72	84	...	106	...	102	108	131	94	...	...	...
Japan[d]	L	624	681	645	726	790	878	805	819	853	921	918	...	...
	U	3,058	3,870	4,890	4,093	5,411	7,241	6,185	6,635	6,854	7,634	7,843	...	...
Korea, Republic of	L	7	11	15	10	15	27	8	10	27	30	40	35	37
	U	138	74	104	98	96	207	80	100	363	173	193	166	200
North Borneo	L	39	46	62	70	98	...	108	95	117	118	...	...	...
	U	18	23	24	29	35	...	37	39	39	41	...	...	...
Pakistan	L	124	120	100	94	120	143	159	134	128	141	175	183	155
	U	236	335	384	378	333	517	324	499	551	543	479	587	411
Philippines	L	483	587	494	466	449	...	...	615	645	...	...	...	...
	U	280	347	297	242	309	...	...	310	349	...	...	...	...
Sarawak	L	444	485	478	441	527	441	506	450	439	454	420	...	...
	U	17	19	17	16	23	25	23	24	24	29	25	...	...
Singapore	L	510	552	554	483	430	448	441	418	419	450	504	527	...
	U	883	921	958	855	773	813	768	745	800	818	890	1,002	...
Thailand (Bangkok)	L	161	164	186	162	175	221	233	216	186	193	288	319	262
	U	116	126	138	142	154	166	154	160	167	162	175	180	162
Viet-Nam (Saigon)	L	39	28	47	40	52	...	54	82	75	73	...	38	...
	U	112	108	115	125	141	...	146	132	145	140	...	140	...
Entrances (E) and clearances (C) of vessels with cargo in external trade *(thousand net registered tons)*														
India	E	806	829	947	1,014	1,079	1,209	1,081	1,061	1,243	1,194	1,338	1,272	1,231
	C	702	737	702	812	960	896	884	812	859	926	987	957	994
CIVIL AVIATION[e]														
Passenger-kilometres *(million)*														
Burma		5.11	4.99	3.36	3.89	3.81	4.52	3.00	4.1	5.2	3.9	4.8	5.3	5.1
Ceylon		0.79	2.45	3.28	3.81	4.04	3.96	4.11	4.0	4.0	4.3	3.53	3.29	3.71
China: Taiwan		3.85	3.99	4.50	4.55	5.48	5.32	5.42	4.67	5.49	5.42	5.71	4.15	4.30
India		42.92	56.60	65.13	72.00	78.23	92.94	82.31	78.13	89.32	102.27	102.04	...	...
Indonesia		19.87	22.40	23.34	16.16	21.40	...	22.93	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran		2.58[f]	2.84[f]	3.33	3.47	3.31	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Japan		27.43	37.96	47.37	57.19	70.18	...	72.37	64.14	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan		9.21	12.03	17.71	19.12	21.10	28.70	21.92	24.22	28.59	29.32	32.66	35.47	32.77
Philippines		10.08	11.74	13.94	15.61	19.75	23.83	20.36	23.09	26.19	21.86	24.19	*20.90*	*17.95*
Thailand		4.14	5.01	6.53	4.18	3.56	5.29	3.96	3.38	3.50	5.85	8.41	8.12	...
Freight ton-kilometres *(thousand)*														
Burma		112	94	66	73	76	89	74	83	83	83	93	101	101
Ceylon		14	118	144	120	161	168	186	164	166	172	172	126	145
China: Taiwan		203	162	165	168	180	164	174	163	153	156	184	143	130
India		2,879	3,215	3,225	3,402	3,473	3,886	3,682	3,485	3,678	3,848	4,535	...	...
Indonesia		662	729	762	453	476	454	499	415	451	471	481	...	...
Iran		50[f]	105[f]	213	284	473	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Japan		508	762	942	1,215	1,614	...	2,126	1,683	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan		214	260	357	543	1,145	1,571	1,374	1,351	1,411	1,548	1,973	1,937	1,632
Philippines		315	335	386	347	407	317	449	296	274	329	368	*429*	*396*
Thailand		107	112	156	73	41	87	41	34	58	117	139	160	...

a. Railway traffic coverage: *China (Taiwan)*, Taiwan Railway Administration; *India* and *Pakistan*, class I railways; *Japan*, State Railways only; *Philippines*, Manila Railroad Company.

b. Including service traffic.

c. Caspian Sea traffic included.

d. Excluding military and charity goods and transit traffic, including imports and exports by air and parcel post.

e. Scheduled domestic and international routes.

f. Including non-scheduled and/or non-revenue operations.

6. VALUE OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS AND BALANCE OF TRADE

Monthly averages or calendar months

Million

		BRUNEI (Malayan dollar)			BURMA (kyat)			CAMBODIA (riel)			CEYLON (rupee)			CHINA (Taiwan) (NT dollar)			FEDERATION OF MALAYA[a] (Malayan dollar)		
		Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	ICA imports	Exports	Imports	Balance
1954		22.8	8.3	+14.5	100	81	+19	184	172	+12	151	116	+35	121	275	125	135	110	+25
1955		25.3	8.7	+16.6	90	72	+18	117	139	−22	162	122	+40	160	262	127	198	129	+69
1956		27.5	9.5	+18.0	98	78	−20	107	165	−58	144	135	+ 9	244	400	166	188	146	+42
1957		28.3	9.0	+19.3	91	117	−26	151	170	−19	140	150	−10	306	438	172	182	151	+31
1958		27.2	7.4	+19.8	77	81	− 4	154	222	−68	142	143	− 1	322	467	138	157	138	+19
1959		25.8	5.2	+20.6	89	88	+ 1	175	204	−29	146	167	−21	476	702	212	206	145	+61
1960		20.7	5.2	+15.5	88	105	−17	203	277	−74	153	163	−10	497	900	329	244	179	+65
1959	IV	25.0	4.9	+20.1	87	109	−22	170	227	−57	161	184	−23	478	665	219	242	165	+77
1960	I	22.4	5.2	+17.2	113	106	+ 7	185	275	−90	170	164	+ 6	490	686	163	247	169	+78
	II	21.1	5.4	+15.7	116	99	+17	139	264	−125	147	156	− 9	557	1,073	472	245	175	+70
	III	*19.6*	*5.2*	*+14.4*	77	105	−28	249	277	−28	148	182	−34	365	942	383	252	184	+68
	IV	*19.0*	*5.0*	*+14.0*	49	111	−62	240	292	−52	146	153	− 7	576	898	298	231	188	+43
1961	Jan	...	...	...	45	106	−61	239	187	+52	152	161	− 9	...	...	...	181	191	−10
	Feb	...	...	...	*62*	*70*	*−12*	228	147	+81	130	118	+12	...	...	...	*187*	*161*	+26

		HONG KONG (HK dollar)			INDIA (rupee)			INDONESIA[c] (rupiah)			IRAN (U.S. Dollar)			JAPAN[d] (1,000 Mn yen)			KOREA,[e] Republic of (US dollar)		
		Exports	Imports	Exports, domestic	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Special procurement	Exports	Imports	Balance
1954		202	286	57	469	515	− 46	823	598	+225	13.3	19.2	− 5.9	48.9	72.0	7.2	2.0	20.6	−18.6
1955		212	310	61	506	561	− 55	898	600	+298	31.0	24.6	+ 6.4	60.3	74.1	5.2	1.5	28.7	−27.2
1956		268	381	65	516	685	−169	851	817	+ 34	42.7	28.8	+13.9	75.0	96.9	5.0	2.1	32.4	−30.3
1957		252	429	62	547	890	−343	921	763	+158	54.2	34.8	+19.4	85.7	128.5	6.9	1.9	37.2	−35.3
1958		249	383	105[b]	485	732	−247	718	488	+230	61.5	47.7	+13.8	86.3	91.0	4.3	1.4	31.5	−30.1
1959		273	412	190	519	740	−221	829	436	+393	63.3	*46.3*	*+17.0*	103.7	108.0	4.7	1.6	23.6	−22.0
1960		328	489	239	529	843	−314	3,152	2,154	+998	...	...	...	121.6	134.8	4.7	2.7	27.4	−24.7
1959	IV	320	474	222	637	682	− 45	915	556	+359	...	...	...	123.9	115.2	2.3	1.3	23.2	−21.9
1960	I	325	487	236	518	691	−173	3,211	1,811	+1,400	...	...	...	106.3	135.6	3.4	1.4	26.2	−24.8
	II	322	490	241	494	832	−338	3,301	2,113	+1,188	...	...	...	115.1	133.4	9.1	2.8	31.1	−28.3
	III	339	483	246	529	772	−243	2,929	2,129	+ 800	...	...	...	125.9	135.8	4.1	2.7	26.2	−23.5
	IV	327	495	232	627	724	− 97	3,138	2,565	+ 573	...	...	...	139.4	134.3	2.1	3.7	26.2	−22.5
1961	Jan	345	498	247	545	834	−289	1,347	...	...	...	...	...	94.0	145.0	2.7	2.5	21.9	−19.4
	Feb	293	415	219	536	743	−207	...	...	...	...	...	...	113.4	155.9	2.3	2.2	19.9	−17.7

		LAOS (kip)			NORTH BORNEO (Malayan dollar)			PAKISTAN (rupee)			PHILIPPINES[f] (peso)			SARAWAK (Malayan dollar)			SINGAPORE[a] (Malayan dollar)		
		Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance
1954		3	47	− 44	6.4	6.2	+0.2	99	92	+ 7	66.8	79.8	−13.0	35.5	33.2	+ 2.3	224	252	−28
1955		4	55	− 51	8.7	7.3	+1.4	125	90	+35	66.8	91.3	−24.5	39.8	36.8	+ 3.0	281	322	−41
1956		4	103	− 99	10.1	9.8	+0.3	135	166	−31	75.5	84.4	− 8.9	40.6	38.7	+ 1.9	286	327	−41
1957		3	122	−119	10.0	10.1	−0.1	134	174	−40	71.8	102.2	−30.4	41.6	38.6	+ 3.0	290	338	−48
1958		5	87	− 82	10.9	10.7	+0.2	118	157	−39	82.1	93.1	−11.0	38.6	36.1	+ 2.5	262	312	−50
1959		7	86	− 79	14.8	13.0	+1.8	127	140	−13	88.2	84.9	+ 3.3	44.4	37.9	+ 6.5	287	326	−39
1960		6	79	− 73	18.6	16.3	+2.3	156	258	−102	92.3	96.1	− 3.8	40.7	37.1	+ 3.6	293	340	−47
1959	IV	8	91	− 83	17.7	14.4	+3.3	172	175	− 3	91.5	97.7	− 6.2	*44.9*	*39.6*	+ 5.3	316	350	−34
1960	I	8	111	−103	16.9	14.5	+2.4	157	218	−61	89.6	86.4	+ 3.2	43.2	36.6	+ 6.6	299	348	−49
	II	6	112	−106	19.1	16.9	+2.2	172	282	−110	113.4	96.3	+17.1	44.4	37.2	+ 7.2	300	344	−44
	III	5	46	− 41	18.0	16.6	+1.4	122	238	−116	128.2	114.0	+14.2	40.0	36.6	+ 3.4	282	332	−50
	IV				20.2	17.3	+2.9	172	299	−127	80.8	106.6	−25.8	35.2	37.8	− 2.6	289	335	−46
1961	Jan	...	...	...	...	...	...	188	256	− 68	71.4	108.4	−37.0	...	...	...	280	331	−51
	Feb	...	...	...	...	...	...	209	225	− 16	74.3	85.9	−11.6	...	...	...	...	...	...

		THAILAND (baht)			VIET-NAM[g] (piastre)		
		Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance
1954		376	556	−180	164	946	−782
1955		543	600	− 57	202	768	−566
1956		577	630	− 53	132	635	−503
1957		628	703	− 75	235	842	−607
1958		537	685	−148	161	677	−516
1959		630	749	−119	219	655	−436
1960		719	786	− 67	250	701	−451
1959	IV	703	818	−115	313	782	−469
1960	I	751	816	− 65	197	698	−501
	II	662	763	−101	258	691	−433
	III	668	790	−122	323	646	−323
	IV	796	777	− 19	219	769	−550
1961	Jan	838	813	− 25	231	832	−601
	Feb	876	716	−160	...	...	...

General Notes: Special trade system for Cambodia, China: Taiwan, Indonesia, Iran, Republic of Korea, Laos, North Borneo, Sarawak and Viet-Nam; general trade for other countries. Figures on imports include aid unless otherwise specified.

a. Including trade between Singapore and Federation of Malaya.

b. For 1958 only, products wholly or principally of Hong Kong origin.

c. Data compiled and published in rupiah at the official rate.

d. Data on Special Procurement not included in data for exports and imports.

e. Prior to 1955, figures based on foreign exchange settlements at the Bank of Korea. From 1955 onwards, government imports are still based on exchange settlements, but exports and private imports are based on data of Bureau of Customs.

f. Imports valued f.o.b.

g. Prior to January 1955, excluding trade with Cambodia and Laos but including transit trade of these countries with other countries through Viet-Nam. Beginning June 1955, trade of the Republic of Viet-Nam only.

7. DIRECTION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Quarterly averages or quarters

Million dollars

Area of origin for imports and area of destination for exports	Year and Quarter	BURMA Exp.	BURMA Imp.	CAMBODIA Exp.	CAMBODIA Imp.	CEYLON Exp.	CEYLON Imp.	CHINA: Taiwan Exp.	CHINA: Taiwan Imp.	FEDERATION OF MALAYA Exp.	FEDERATION OF MALAYA Imp.	HONG KONG Exp.	HONG KONG Imp.	INDIA Exp.	INDIA Imp.	INDONESIA[b] Exp.	INDONESIA[b] Imp.
1. All countries	1953	59.4	44.2	...	...	82.3	84.5	31.9	45.5	75.2	73.1	120.8	170.6	279.0	300.2	210.0	191.2
	1954	62.1	51.1	...	...	95.0	73.4	23.3	52.8	76.2	66.1	120.3	164.9	295.6	323.8	214.0	157.3
	1955	56.7	45.2	10.0	11.9	101.8	76.7	30.8	50.2	112.3	78.1	127.5	180.0	319.1	353.4	236.4	157.8
	1956	61.5	49.4	9.3	13.7	91.1	85.8	29.6	48.4	117.0	186.2	163.0	221.2	312.8	427.2	220.5	213.3
	1957	52.5	74.0	12.9	14.6	88.3	94.7	37.1	53.1	114.2	90.0	149.8	243.0	337.5	538.6	242.4	199.2
	1958	45.3	50.8	13.9	18.7	86.7	90.1	39.0	56.6	101.7	81.3	141.1	211.5	304.0	453.7	188.8	128.3
	1959	55.7	55.7	14.4	16.5	88.8	105.3	39.2	57.9	136.4	83.3	157.3	229.8	327.0	465.9	218.1	114.7
	1960	*55.7*	*64.7*	*17.4*	*23.7*	*93.2*	*102.9*	*41.0*	*74.2*	*169.4*	*106.8*	*186.2*	*251.9*	*333.5*	*531.1*	...	...
	1960 I	*71.4*	*67.0*	*15.9*	*23.6*	104.3	103.7	40.4	56.6	171.6	100.2	184.6	270.4	321.7	441.4	214.1	120.7
	II	*73.1*	*62.4*	*11.9*	*22.5*	88.4	98.0	*46.0*	*88.5*	165.7	102.9	*179.9*	*264.1*	*313.5*	*524.3*	219.9	*140.9*
	III	*49.1*	*65.9*	*21.4*	*23.7*	*90.7*	*113.7*	*30.1*	*77.7*	*175.8*	*111.7*	*192.8*	*267.8*	*314.4*	*560.4*	*196.5*	*141.5*
	IV	*29.2*	*63.4*	*20.5*	*25.1*	*89.3*	*96.1*	*47.5*	*74.1*	*164.5*	*112.4*	*187.3*	*205.1*	*384.5*	*598.3*	...	...
2. ECAFE countries[a] (excluding Japan)	1953	45.0	22.9	...	...	16.6	34.9	21.8	17.5	13.5	35.2	90.0	93.4	54.4	42.5	72.2	78.2
	1954	52.2	26.3	...	...	19.0	32.6	18.8	20.7	14.0	31.9	72.5	76.1	48.7	62.4	86.0	64.8
	1955	40.4	22.0	4.3	7.4	15.4	35.0	25.6	18.0	16.1	38.7	69.0	91.7	62.4	70.2	81.1	48.0
	1956	45.5	23.1	3.3	8.8	17.4	39.6	23.0	19.9	20.7	40.6	93.1	115.6	55.5	76.6	85.2	77.0
	1957	39.0	35.8	5.3	8.3	15.9	43.6	28.9	20.6	28.2	43.4	75.8	120.7	56.7	97.0	105.6	68.8
	1958	34.1	26.4	4.9	9.5	8.5	38.8	31.2	25.2	26.3	40.5	62.9	114.9	54.0	86.2	88.2	51.8
	1959	38.7	29.8	5.0	8.7	9.9	42.4	32.3	26.7	34.7	42.2	57.3	119.8	61.8	72.0	91.5	50.0
	1960	...	...	*6.8*	*11.2*	*12.9*	*44.8*	*30.1*	*30.3*	*42.0*	*57.5*	*64.6*	*136.5*	*57.8*	*87.8*	...	...
	1960 I	*51.7*	*34.0*	*6.3*	*11.2*	19.6	43.5	30.1	23.1	41.9	53.9	65.3	139.2	57.1	83.7	82.4	63.1
	II	...	...	*4.8*	*9.3*	9.5	43.3	35.9	*30.7*	42.6	54.3	*59.5*	*130.3*	*61.1*	*83.7*	99.3	*67.0*
	III	...	...	*8.4*	*12.5*	*11.9*	*52.1*	*20.6*	*34.5*	*47.5*	*62.4*	*63.5*	*134.1*	*53.1*	*78.9*	*90.6*	*64.3*
	IV	...	...	*7.6*	*11.6*	*11.4*	*42.8*	*33.6*	*32.7*	*36.2*	*58.2*	*70.3*	*142.6*	*59.8*	*104.9*	...	...
3. Japan	1953	11.2	7.3	...	...	0.5	3.6	14.5	13.5	5.0	1.9	9.7	16.8	14.2	6.5	9.4	31.8
	1954	14.6	11.2	...	...	0.8	4.0	11.9	17.6	5.3	2.2	5.0	20.3	8.6	8.8	12.5	34.2
	1955	11.4	9.6	0.1	1.2	0.6	5.2	18.3	15.3	7.3	3.6	6.4	23.0	13.8	16.9	18.3	21.6
	1956	9.4	8.2	0.4	2.6	0.8	6.0	11.0	17.6	9.8	3.8	13.9	35.5	15.7	22.9	18.4	33.4
	1957	5.9	17.7	0.3	2.4	1.4	6.8	13.1	17.6	14.4	3.6	10.0	33.4	14.4	28.6	10.0	30.0
	1958	2.5	12.2	0.1	3.3	2.0	8.2	16.3	22.4	13.4	3.2	5.2	26.1	13.6	20.8	6.8	17.4
	1959	2.1	12.6	0.6	2.2	2.2	7.8	16.3	23.4	24.6	4.5	10.1	33.7	18.1	21.5	8.3	17.1
	1960	*2.9*	*12.4*	*1.2*	*3.7*	*2.9*	*8.7*	*15.5*	*26.2*	*29.0*	*7.3*	*10.1*	*41.2*	*18.0*	*28.5*	...	...
	1960 I	*3.2*	*10.5*	*1.6*	*3.5*	4.1	8.4	16.7	19.2	28.7	6.7	12.3	41.1	18.1	20.1	9.9	14.0
	II	*5.5*	*11.1*	*0.3*	*2.7*	2.7	8.2	*19.8*	*27.3*	29.5	6.0	*8.9*	*42.9*	*22.3*	*28.4*	7.8	*26.6*
	III	*1.3*	*10.9*	*1.0*	*4.2*	*2.4*	*9.0*	*8.9*	*30.7*	*33.4*	*6.9*	*9.2*	*38.2*	*13.7*	*27.3*	*8.8*	*24.1*
	IV	*1.7*	*17.0*	*1.7*	*4.3*	*2.4*	*9.1*	*16.4*	*27.6*	*24.5*	*9.4*	*10.0*	*42.6*	*17.9*	*38.0*	...	...
4. Western Europe (excluding UK)	1953	6.4	16.9	...	...	30.4	27.3	3.9	6.3	36.8	28.3	10.5	50.9	102.7	127.8	74.2	65.2
	1954	5.4	20.2	...	...	34.8	24.2	1.4	4.5	37.2	27.2	10.6	42.4	122.2	144.2	71.6	52.0
	1955	8.8	18.8	3.1	3.7	38.8	26.6	1.7	3.5	58.3	31.4	15.9	41.6	126.6	159.2	79.3	60.4
	1956	7.6	18.9	3.1	3.0	35.8	30.2	1.8	4.5	54.8	36.4	18.6	46.9	130.6	219.6	80.8	75.8
	1957	4.9	27.2	3.3	4.4	31.6	29.2	1.3	4.9	50.0	36.5	20.7	61.2	119.3	265.6	78.0	73.6
	1958	4.4	17.1	3.8	7.3	37.8	30.4	1.5	4.9	42.8	31.9	24.9	46.9	116.2	190.9	47.4	42.2
	1959	8.9	18.2	4.8	5.9	36.4	35.9	2.2	5.6	50.5	32.0	29.7	50.5	126.1	206.9	72.0	34.7
	1960	...	...	*6.4*	*8.7*	*36.5*	*32.8*	*2.5*	*8.3*	*72.6*	*37.7*	*38.5*	*59.8*	*125.0*	*221.1*	...	...
	1960 I	*10.3*	*21.8*	*5.7*	*8.9*	39.3	33.8	1.7	5.5	73.1	34.8	36.6	59.1	125.0	198.8	68.0	30.5
	II	...	...	*4.5*	*10.1*	37.5	40.3	*1.5*	*13.0*	72.3	37.4	*39.6*	*61.1*	*103.6*	*242.0*	47.7	*41.4*
	III	...	...	*6.9*	*6.4*	*35.3*	*32.2*	*3.1*	*8.1*	*74.7*	*38.4*	*40.6*	*57.9*	*116.4*	*220.2*	*33.7*	*41.2*
	IV	..	...	*8.4*	*9.3*	*34.7*	*29.6*	*3.6*	*6.7*	*71.2*	*40.1*	*37.5*	*61.0*	*155.1*	*223.5*	...	...
5. United Kingdom	1953	4.4	11.8	...	...	20.4	19.0	2.1	2.0	18.5	23.1	5.2	20.8	78.5	74.2	4.4	13.5
	1954	3.9	12.5	...	...	26.4	15.4	0.7	1.3	14.9	21.3	7.1	16.2	93.1	79.2	9.8	8.5
	1955	4.8	11.5	0.2	0.1	26.5	16.2	0.9	0.6	26.5	24.1	11.0	19.3	88.3	84.8	23.0	8.7
	1956	4.6	10.4	0.1	0.2	26.3	18.3	0.7	0.8	23.2	27.2	13.0	22.4	96.7	109.1	19.6	12.9
	1957	3.2	15.7	—	0.2	24.1	19.4	0.3	0.8	24.6	26.8	14.7	29.2	84.5	125.2	17.6	11.4
	1958	3.4	9.4	0.1	0.4	29.7	21.8	0.2	1.0	20.7	24.5	17.2	23.2	87.3	88.5	24.0	6.8
	1959	4.9	10.7	—	0.2	25.2	26.0	0.4	0.9	19.2	21.4	20.2	25.1	90.4	90.7	47.7	7.6
	1960	*5.1*	*9.0*	*1.1*	*0.5*	*26.4*	*22.8*	*0.7*	*1.1*	*247*	*26.0*	*26.6*	*29.1*	*91.6*	*105.8*	...	...
	1960 I	5.5	*10.5*	*0.2*	*0.5*	27.8	22.4	0.3	1.0	24.0	24.0	24.7	29.9	87.7	96.0	48.3	8.0
	II	*5.0*	*9.5*	*0.2*	*0.5*	27.1	24.1	*0.3*	*1.1*	30.3	26.0	*27.2*	*29.8*	*69.4*	*114.7*	16.5	*12.1*
	III	*5.7*	*7.6*	*0.8*	*0.6*	*25.2*	*22.3*	*0.6*	*1.4*	*22.2*	*25.5*	*28.5*	*27.7*	*89.2*	*100.7*	*10.4*	*10.4*
	IV	*4.2*	*8.2*	*3.2*	*0.5*	*25.4*	*22.2*	*1.4*	*0.7*	*22.3*	*28.5*	*26.0*	*28.8*	*119.9*	*111.8*	...	...
6. Eastern Europe	1953	—	0.2	...	...	0.2	0.6	—	—	1.5	0.2	—	1.0	1.8	2.0	1.1	1.4
	1954	0.2	0.6	...	...	0.1	0.6	—	—	1.9	0.2	—	1.0	2.8	4.0	1.8	3.3
	1955	5.6	0.4	—	—	0.1	0.4	—	—	2.1	0.2	—	0.8	2.2	4.2	6.7	7.2
	1956	5.6	3.8	—	—	0.1	0.4	—	—	4.7	0.3	—	0.8	9.1	13.8	3.0	2.8
	1957	4.4	5.2	—	—	0.3	0.4	—	—	3.4	0.4	—	0.6	12.6	19.8	2.2	1.6
	1958	2.8	3.4	—	0.2	0.3	0.4	—	—	9.6	0.2	—	0.4	16.0	17.7	2.7	1.0
	1959	2.4	2.5	0.2	0.5	1.7	1.3	—	—	18.7	0.2	—	0.5	22.5	16.2	5.0	1.9
	1960	...	...	*1.4*	*1.3*	*3.1*	*1.4*	—	—	*17.2*	*0.3*	—	*0.8*	*23.8*	*17.8*	...	...
	1960 I	*3.2*	*4.6*	—	1.4	2.0	0.8	—	—	9.9	0.3	—	0.8	22.9	13.6	6.0	1.9
	II	...	...	*0.4*	*1.0*	4.0	1.1	—	—	15.5	0.2	—	*0.8*	*26.5*	*15.9*	6.6	*2.0*
	III	...	...	*2.7*	*1.7*	*0.9*	*1.9*	—	—	*15.5*	*0.2*	—	*0.8*	*19.3*	*21.9*	*10.9*	*4.4*
	IV	...	...	*2.3*	*1.2*	*5.6*	*1.9*	—	—	*27.0*	*0.3*	—	*0.9*	*26.6*	*19.9*	...	...

7. DIRECTION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE (Cont'd)

Quarterly averages or quarters

Million dollars

Area of origin for imports and area of destination for exports	Year and Quarter	BURMA Exp.	BURMA Imp.	CAMBODIA Exp.	CAMBODIA Imp.	CEYLON Exp.	CEYLON Imp.	CHINA: Taiwan Exp.	CHINA: Taiwan Imp.	FEDERATION OF MALAYA Exp.	FEDERATION OF MALAYA Imp.	HONG KONG Exp.	HONG KONG Imp.	INDIA Exp.	INDIA Imp.	INDONESIA Exp.
7. North America	1953	1.1	1.8	...	...	10.8	3.6	1.4	19.4	21.0	2.2	4.3	12.5	58.6	57.0	48.4
	1954	0.3	2.1	...	...	10.2	2.6	1.3	25.3	18.7	1.5	5.0	14.8	54.2	44.2	36.6
	1955	0.3	1.4	2.6	0.7	14.5	5.4	1.4	24.6	29.7	1.7	6.4	16.3	61.1	52.2	49.9
	1956	0.4	1.4	2.5	1.5	12.8	4.2	1.7	20.6	31.7	2.1	7.8	20.6	58.0	53.6	36.2
	1957	0.9	3.0	2.6	0.8	12.5	4.4	1.4	21.6	26.2	2.5	12.0	25.8	81.3	97.2	37.8
	1958	0.4	2.2	3.7	1.7	11.6	5.3	2.5	21.6	17.7	1.8	20.6	21.4	61.2	103.4	33.1
	1959	0.6	2.7	3.5	1.3	13.6	8.3	3.6	21.2	24.9	2.1	33.6	26.3	60.5	115.4	36.5
	1960	...	...	2.0	2.3	13.4	4.6	5.0	28.9	27.0	3.2	39.7	37.3	65.9	136.0	...
	1960 I	0.2	3.1	2.8	1.9	14.9	5.7	4.4	18.6	35.5	2.3	44.8	35.6	62.4	71.1	44.8
	II	...	...	1.6	2.0	12.8	2.6	3.9	36.7	24.6	2.7	42.1	44.8	67.8	117.4	53.1
	III	...	...	2.1	2.7	13.4	5.6	5.1	31.9	26.9	3.5	41.8	37.5	63.3	170.5	47.2
	IV	...	...	1.4	2.7	12.4	4.5	6.7	28.3	21.2	4.4	32.4	31.4	70.3	185.0	...
8. United States of America	1953	1.1	1.8	...	...	6.4	2.7	1.3	17.9	19.0	2.0	3.3	9.9	51.2	47.2	43.0
	1954	0.3	2.1	...	...	6.2	1.9	1.3	24.6	16.4	1.3	4.1	12.4	46.2	38.8	35.9
	1955	0.3	1.3	2.6	0.6	9.3	2.4	1.4	23.9	26.7	1.5	5.2	14.3	48.7	47.2	41.8
	1956	0.4	1.4	2.4	1.4	7.4	2.1	1.7	20.4	28.2	1.8	6.5	18.6	46.0	49.5	35.3
	1957	0.6	2.9	2.5	0.8	7.8	3.6	1.3	21.2	23.1	2.2	10.0	23.6	69.3	89.4	36.9
	1958	0.4	2.2	3.7	1.7	7.1	4.0	2.4	21.1	15.2	1.6	15.6	19.2	48.9	84.8	32.6
	1959	0.6	2.5	3.5	1.2	8.6	7.2	3.4	20.9	21.9	1.8	27.2	22.8	50.2	102.6	35.8
	1960	0.2	2.2	1.9	2.2	8.6	3.7	4.7	28.3	23.6	2.9	33.4	31.5	53.4	126.0	...
	1960 I	0.2	2.5	2.8	1.6	11.1	4.6	4.2	18.0	31.5	1.9	37.3	32.5	53.1	63.9	44.3
	II	0.2	2.3	1.6	2.0	8.1	2.2	3.4	36.2	21.5	2.5	35.8	36.9	58.8	110.6	52.4
	III	0.2	1.9	2.1	2.7	8.3	3.8	4.8	31.3	22.9	2.4	34.8	30.4	49.1	158.5	46.4
	IV	0.2	2.1	1.3	2.6	7.1	4.0	6.5	27.6	18.6	4.8	27.0	26.3	52.4	171.0	...
9. Latin American Republics	1953	—	—	...	...	0.4	—	0.4	0.1	1.4	—	—	0.4	16.1	1.5	0.4
	1954	—	—	...	...	0.2	—	0.3	0.2	1.8	—	—	5.0	12.2	4.8	1.4
	1955	—	0.2	—	0.1	0.5	2.4	0.1	0.1	2.6	—	—	1.0	11.8	3.0	6.6
	1956	—	—	—	0.1	0.7	1.7	0.1	—	1.7	0.1	0.1	2.5	8.6	1.3	0.6
	1957	—	—	—	—	1.0	—	0.1	0.1	3.4	0.1	1.1	1.1	11.4	1.3	0.8
	1958	—	—	—	—	0.5	—	0.2	0.1	1.7	0.1	1.1	0.8	10.4	0.9	0.6
	1959	—	—	—	0.1	0.5	—	—	0.1	3.0	0.1	3.0	1.4	8.0	1.3	0.3
	1960	...	...	—	0.1	0.5	—	—	0.1	4.2	0.1	3.2	1.8	8.6	1.0	...
	1960 I	—	—	—	0.3	0.4	—	—	—	4.2	0.1	3.2	0.3	5.8	0.8	0.6
	II	...	...	—	—	0.5	—	—	—	3.2	—	2.9	0.9	7.0	0.9	0.6
	III	...	...	—	0.1	0.6	—	—	0.2	4.5	0.2	3.4	3.3	11.3	1.2	1.3
	IV	...	...	—	—	0.5	—	—	0.1	4.4	0.1	3.4	2.6	10.1	1.0	...
10. Oceania	1953	—	1.1	...	...	8.7	9.2	0.2	0.6	0.8	6.6	2.1	2.5	10.2	14.5	6.0
	1954	—	1.0	...	...	11.2	5.6	0.1	0.6	1.5	4.3	3.0	2.8	14.6	8.7	8.6
	1955	—	1.3	—	—	10.2	4.6	—	0.2	1.9	4.5	3.6	3.7	16.7	11.2	6.3
	1956	—	1.6	—	—	7.3	5.0	—	0.5	1.6	4.9	3.8	4.8	14.8	7.3	9.4
	1957	—	1.7	—	—	6.9	5.7	—	0.3	1.5	5.4	4.5	5.2	16.6	10.2	12.1
	1958	0.1	1.2	—	—	7.9	3.0	0.1	0.6	2.1	5.0	5.0	5.2	14.7	8.6	12.2
	1959	—	1.6	—	—	7.6	5.1	0.1	0.6	3.2	5.0	5.5	6.2	13.0	6.8	8.4
	1960	...	...	—	0.1	8.0	5.4	0.1	1.0	4.6	5.9	7.5	6.4	16.0	12.5	...
	1960 I	—	1.2	—	0.1	8.9	4.5	0.1	0.6	4.6	6.6	5.9	6.8	11.7	9.8	9.4
	II	...	...	—	0.2	7.6	3.3	0.1	1.1	5.7	5.8	6.3	5.6	13.8	7.8	9.3
	III	...	...	—	0.1	9.6	7.5	0.1	0.8	5.1	5.5	9.4	7.0	20.6	13.9	9.2
	IV	...	...	—	0.1	6.1	6.4	0.1	1.3	2.9	5.6	8.5	6.8	18.0	18.7	...
11. Sterling area	1953	34.0	28.2	...	...	39.1	53.5	8.3	6.4	24.5	39.3	32.2	45.4	146.9	145.1	67.8
	1954	38.8	28.1	...	...	52.6	42.6	5.7	4.3	22.7	24.5	36.2	36.6	167.7	162.5	84.3
	1955	27.4	23.4	1.6	2.8	54.5	45.3	5.0	2.5	34.9	38.6	42.5	42.4	164.9	162.3	84.9
	1956	29.1	19.6	2.2	4.3	48.3	46.8	8.3	3.1	32.7	42.8	46.1	48.0	164.1	172.4	84.1
	1957	32.7	31.9	4.1	4.8	45.8	51.8	11.7	8.4	34.1	42.2	48.6	55.6	157.3	192.0	108.2
	1958	29.5	20.0	4.3	4.1	46.5	46.0	8.6	7.3	29.2	40.0	50.8	45.1	154.3	161.2	95.6
	1959	35.3	24.8	3.9	4.6	42.2	57.1	8.0	6.2	29.4	37.6	56.9	56.2	155.5	144.2	118.3
	1960	...	...	5.8	5.8	43.9	55.3	10.6	5.9	39.4	42.5	69.3	59.7	152.3	178.8	...
	1960 I	37.4	26.8	4.0	5.7	45.8	53.5	8.0	6.6	39.9	41.3	65.8	62.9	146.2	162.5	110.7
	II	...	...	4.1	5.2	44.4	52.2	12.3	5.7	45.1	41.2	66.8	59.8	26.5	185.7	93.5
	III	...	...	7.3	6.7	45.0	61.2	8.9	5.2	38.6	42.8	73.4	57.4	151.4	171.6	87.3
	IV	...	...	7.9	5.7	41.2	54.4	13.1	6.0	33.4	44.7	72.3	59.1	285.0	195.3	...
12. ECAFE sterling countries[a]	1953	26.1	14.9	...	...	3.1	19.6	5.5	3.7	4.8	9.3	20.1	18.5	32.4	32.5	56.0
	1954	31.9	14.4	...	...	6.0	18.5	4.8	2.4	5.4	6.7	19.4	14.3	31.2	49.1	65.3
	1955	21.4	10.6	1.4	2.7	6.4	22.1	3.7	1.6	4.9	8.7	20.6	16.2	31.8	40.0	54.5
	1956	25.3	7.6	2.2	4.1	5.2	21.2	6.7	1.8	6.1	9.1	21.6	16.7	28.1	31.2	55.6
	1957	26.0	13.7	4.1	4.6	3.1	23.6	7.8	2.2	6.4	8.6	21.7	15.4	29.4	31.8	78.1
	1958	24.0	9.2	4.2	3.7	2.5	18.2	6.6	2.2	5.0	9.0	21.4	11.2	29.2	20.4	59.5
	1959	27.6	12.1	3.8	4.4	3.6	22.6	6.8	2.1	5.6	9.7	22.5	17.8	29.9	23.8	62.0
	1960	...	...	4.7	5.1	3.7	23.8	8.2	2.5	8.2	9.2	25.4	17.4	26.1	34.4	...
	1960 I	30.6	13.2	3.8	5.0	3.0	21.8	6.4	2.6	9.2	8.9	25.0	19.7	26.8	36.5	53.3
	II	...	...	3.9	4.4	4.3	23.2	8.8	2.3	7.4	7.2	24.0	18.4	23.0	34.3	67.7
	III	...	...	6.5	6.2	5.2	30.1	7.8	2.2	9.5	9.7	25.0	16.1	26.1	33.8	67.8
	IV	...	...	4.7	4.9	3.0	22.9	9.7	3.0	6.7	10.2	27.7	16.1	28.7	33.0	...

GENERAL NOTES: (1) For details and explanatory notes, see United Nations *Direction of International Trade* (Statistical Paper series T).

(2) As complete breakdowns are not given, the sum of total trade of any individual country with different regions does not add up to the total given under trade with "all countries".

(3) See general note to table 6.

(4) Trade between the Federation of Malaya and Singapore is excluded.

a. ECAFE countries comprise:

i) Sterling countries — Brunei, Burma, Ceylon, Federation of Malaya, Hong Kong, India, North Borneo, Pakistan, Sarawak and Singapore.

ii) Non-sterling countries—Afghanistan, Cambodia, China: Taiwan, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Laos, Philippines, Thailand and Viet-Nam.

7. DIRECTION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE *(Cont'd)*

Quarterly averages or quarters

Million dollars

Area of origin for imports and area of destination for exports	Year and Quarter	JAPAN Exp.	JAPAN Imp.	KOREA, Republic of Exp.	KOREA, Republic of Imp.[c]	LAOS Exp.	LAOS Imp.	PAKISTAN Exp.	PAKISTAN Imp.	PHILIPPINES Exp.	PHILIPPINES Imp.[e]	SINGAPORE Exp.	SINGAPORE Imp.	THAILAND[e] Exp.	THAILAND[e] Imp.	VIET-NAM[f] Exp.	VIET-NAM[f] Imp.
1. All countries	1953	318.7	602.4	9.9	66.9	...	...	109.7	87.5	101.0	114.2	171.3	191.4	87.1	75.8	...	...
	1954	407.3	599.8	6.1	55.4	...	...	89.7	81.2	101.3	120.7	177.8	190.3	73.0	67.8	...	...
	1955	502.7	617.9	4.5	85.0	0.4	4.7	100.2	72.3	100.2	136.9	227.2	234.0	90.8	75.0	17.2	65.8
	1956	625.2	807.4	6.2	96.6	0.3	8.8	85.0	104.1	112.8	126.6	223.2	253.1	83.6	92.4	11.3	54.4
	1957	714.6	1,071.0	5.6	110.0	0.3	10.4	84.2	110.0	107.9	153.6	226.5	267.7	91.2	103.2	19.9	72.1
	1958	719.2	758.4	4.1	94.6	0.4	6.8	74.4	99.1	123.3	140.5	202.6	253.2	77.2	96.1	13.8	58.0
	1959	864.1	899.9	4.8	70.7	3.6	6.8	80.0	88.3	132.4	127.3	222.2	253.7	89.8	104.8	18.8	56.2
	1960	*1,013.9*	*1,123.3*	*8.0*	*82.3*	*4.7*	*5.3*	*98.3*	*162.6*	*135.3*	*144.1*	*215.2*	*263.4*	*102.2*	*112.2*	*21.0*	*59.9*
	1960 I	885.8	1,130.0	4.1	60.8	9.5	4.2	99.2	137.2	121.7	129.6	227.7	270.2	106.7	115.9	16.9	59.8
	II	*958.5*	*1,131.8*	8.4	81.7	*8.0*	*12.5*	108.2	178.0	*170.1*	*144.4*	224.6	263.3	*94.1*	*108.5*	22.2	*59.3*
	III	*1,049.4*	*1,131.8*	*8.1*	*69.2*	*1.4*	*4.5*	*77.2*	*150.2*	*128.2*	*142.5*	*208.3*	*253.5*	95.0	*112.3*	*27.7*	*55.4*
	IV	*1,161.9*	*1,119.4*	*11.2*	*78.5*			*108.5*	*184.8*	*121.2*	*159.9*	*200.1*	*266.5*	*113.0*	*112.0*	*17.3*	*65.0*
2. ECAFE countries[a] (including Japan)	1953	142.7	164.0	2.2	30.8	...	...	37.0	13.6	13.4	13.9	63.9	118.1	63.5	35.0	...	...
	1954	173.6	144.8	2.5	27.2	...	...	26.5	17.2	14.5	20.3	59.5	115.6	50.0	32.8	...	...
	1955	179.9	182.7	2.8	9.1	0.3	2.9	37.2	17.1	16.9	25.8	70.8	152.0	53.8	36.2	5.6	17.4
	1956	222.7	195.2	2.6	4.9	0.3	5.5	30.0	12.6	22.9	26.3	82.1	160.5	51.2	46.8	1.4	19.7
	1957	247.9	210.2	3.8	5.5	0.2	6.1	27.4	23.9	22.7	35.9	92.8	168.7	58.5	48.1	3.9	24.0
	1958	218.8	162.2	2.8	5.4	0.2	3.7	17.2	24.8	27.2	39.0	89.9	164.5	46.4	48.7	4.3	19.1
	1959	240.8	192.2	3.5	14.0	3.6	1.9	20.5	22.0	33.1	38.6	80.2	175.4	49.6	51.1	3.8	19.8
	1960	*312.4*	*225.9*	*6.0*	*24.2*	*4.7*	*2.0*	*30.9*	*38.2*	*36.8*	*48.3*	*79.4*	*177.0*	*67.6*	*52.5*	*5.6*	*20.0*
	1960 I	253.8	234.9	2.4	13.6	9.4	2.6	33.5	30.1	34.3	33.9	81.7	189.4	63.6	52.7	5.5	18.2
	II	*269.9*	*227.5*	6.0	27.7	*8.0*	*2.9*	39.5	35.9	*43.9*	*38.0*	81.0	167.3	*58.0*	*48.8*	*9.6*	*18.0*
	III	*331.2*	225.1	*5.9*	*21.0*	*1.3*	*2.4*	*28.7*	*30.3*	*34.4*	*45.4*	*74.0*	*168.0*	*60.5*	*50.6*	*5.5*	*18.0*
	IV	*382.5*	*203.9*	*9.6*	*23.8*			*21.9*	*56.6*	*34.4*	*76.0*	*79.1*	*176.6*	*89.7*	*57.5*	*3.6*	*25.9*
3. Japan	1953	.	.	1.5	26.7	...	...	21.4	4.5	12.0	5.1	7.9	8.6	21.2	13.1	...	...
	1954	.	.	1.8	17.2	...	...	7.8	8.7	12.6	7.3	8.2	9.8	17.3	16.3	...	...
	1955	.	.	1.8	4.2	—	0.4	11.6	10.2	15.2	10.8	16.2	15.9	15.8	15.8	0.4	8.8
	1956	.	.	2.0	2.3	—	1.4	10.6	5.2	20.1	12.8	17.6	17.2	7.2	15.2	0.1	14.0
	1957	.	.	2.7	2.9	—	2.3	11.0	4.0	19.5	18.4	19.9	18.4	7.2	21.1	1.0	15.4
	1958	.	.	2.4	3.6	—	1.1	7.5	5.6	24.2	20.3	15.4	22.0	5.8	22.5	0.2	11.2
	1959	.	.	3.2	8.0	—	0.6	6.6	5.1	29.2	22.5	16.0	19.9	10.5	26.4	0.5	11.9
	1960	.	.	*5.0*	*17.4*	—	*0.3*	*7.1*	*13.8*	*32.3*	*34.9*	*12.8*	*24.4*	*18.1*	*29.0*	*0.6*	*13.2*
	1960 I	.	.	1.3	7.2	—	0.6	8.9	13.0	31.5	19.2	14.5	25.1	16.3	29.5	0.3	9.9
	II	.	.	5.2	21.3	—	0.3	7.6	15.5	*37.8*	*22.6*	12.4	22.0	*16.6*	*25.0*	0.7	10.5
	III	.	.	*5.4*	*14.9*	—	*0.3*	*7.0*	*12.8*	*29.1*	*35.1*	*12.6*	*23.4*	*12.5*	*27.8*	*0.8*	*12.0*
	IV	.	.	*8.3*	*15.7*			*4.9*	*14.0*	*30.7*	*62.7*	*11.7*	*26.9*	*27.1*	*33.6*	*0.5*	*20.3*
4. Western Europe (including UK)	1953	28.9	50.8	0.1	4.2	...	...	53.6	25.4	13.8	5.8	44.4	44.3	3.3	24.7	...	...
	1954	36.9	49.2	0.1	4.4	...	...	43.4	39.2	20.2	10.7	52.2	45.1	6.4	22.7	...	...
	1955	49.0	43.8	0.3	5.9	—	1.4	42.2	31.4	18.1	12.4	78.3	50.8	7.5	24.4	5.9	35.2
	1956	63.7	58.0	0.9	3.7	—	2.3	39.0	29.6	23.5	16.3	73.5	55.9	8.1	28.4	7.7	17.9
	1957	79.6	97.5	0.8	2.0	0.1	2.8	37.8	42.8	22.8	23.2	62.1	60.4	8.4	34.1	10.5	30.5
	1958	82.3	65.9	0.6	3.6	0.1	2.1	39.6	38.8	23.3	18.6	54.1	52.7	11.3	27.9	7.9	23.7
	1959	89.5	87.6	0.6	16.6	—	4.4	34.5	35.9	22.5	20.7	60.7	46.6	8.4	32.6	10.7	19.6
	1960	*116.8*	*98.1*	*1.1*	*19.7*	—	*3.0*	*37.0*	*67.9*	*26.5*	*20.0*	*60.9*	*52.9*	*14.3*	*35.3*	*11.0*	*22.0*
	1960 I	122.9	97.2	0.9	18.0	—	1.1	38.3	56.5	22.8	20.7	65.9	49.9	13.8	39.8	8.8	23.2
	II	*99.0*	*96.4*	1.3	19.2	—	*9.2*	35.8	77.9	*27.8*	*22.0*	64.6	55.0	*13.2*	*34.8*	8.5	24.6
	III	*105.0*	*96.2*	*1.1*	*15.0*	—	*1.8*	*24.5*	*64.6*	*31.6*	*18.7*	*57.9*	*50.7*	*10.3*	*33.4*	*16.1*	*20.6*
	IV	*140.6*	*102.8*	*0.9*	*13.6*			*49.5*	*72.5*	*23.6*	*18.7*	*57.9*	*56.1*	*19.8*	*33.0*	*10.6*	*21.6*
5. United Kingdom	1953	8.3	12.2	0.1	0.6	...	...	21.1	14.4	1.3	1.1	21.1	31.0	0.6	10.0	...	...
	1954	12.8	9.3	0.1	1.5	...	...	17.4	23.2	1.2	2.3	22.1	27.8	1.8	8.1	...	...
	1955	15.2	9.5	—	1.1	—	0.1	15.2	17.6	1.4	3.2	35.8	32.3	1.8	8.6	0.4	1.1
	1956	15.8	16.6	0.2	0.6	—	0.3	13.6	14.4	1.7	3.8	33.0	34.7	2.6	10.6	0.1	0.9
	1957	18.4	24.6	0.2	0.3	—	0.6	13.4	21.0	1.7	5.8	25.1	36.6	2.8	11.6	—	1.6
	1958	26.3	14.8	0.2	0.4	—	0.3	14.7	17.6	1.6	4.8	20.9	32.7	4.1	10.3	0.3	1.6
	1959	25.8	25.9	0.2	2.0	—	2.9	14.8	15.6	2.2	5.4	22.4	26.5	2.7	10.8	0.6	1.5
	1960	*30.0*	*24.8*	*0.5*	*2.3*	—	*2.2*	*17.1*	*28.6*	*2.9*	*5.7*	*23.4*	*29.7*	*4.5*	*11.4*	*1.2*	*1.7*
	1960 I	32.1	24.1	0.3	3.1	—	0.2	15.4	23.7	2.6	5.3	23.2	30.1	3.5	10.0	1.4	1.7
	II	*22.0*	*19.5*	0.5	1.8	—	*7.5*	17.3	29.1	*3.9*	*6.4*	25.8	30.3	*2.3*	*12.8*	0.4	1.6
	III	*24.2*	*25.4*	*0.2*	*2.1*	—	*1.1*	*10.3*	*30.5*	*2.5*	*6.2*	*24.3*	*29.3*	*2.5*	*11.2*	*1.6*	*1.6*
	IV	*41.8*	*30.3*	*0.3*	*2.1*			*15.3*	*31.2*	*2.4*	*4.9*	*20.4*	*28.9*	*9.6*	*11.6*	*1.3*	*1.7*
6. Eastern Europe	1953	1.0	1.4	—	—	...	...	3.2	0.4	—	—	2.8	1.4	—	0.1	...	...
	1954	1.3	1.1	—	—	...	...	2.0	0.7	—	0.1	2.1	0.9	—	—	...	...
	1955	3.8	0.8	—	—	—	—	1.7	0.2	—	—	2.7	0.8	0.1	—	—	—
	1956	0.6	0.8	—	—	—	—	1.3	0.4	—	—	6.3	1.0	—	0.5	—	0.1
	1957	3.9	4.6	—	—	—	—	2.8	0.9	—	—	8.3	1.1	—	0.8	—	—
	1958	5.1	5.9	—	—	—	—	3.7	2.1	—	—	10.8	0.8	—	0.8	—	—
	1959	9.6	11.0	—	—	—	—	3.0	1.2	—	—	19.6	0.8	0.1	0.8	—	—
	1960	*17.1*	*23.5*	—	—	—	—	*4.4*	*3.6*	—	—	*14.8*	*1.3*	*0.2*	*1.4*	—	—
	1960 I	8.5	15.5	—	—	—	—	4.1	2.9	—	—	8.8	1.3	0.9	1.3	—	—
	II	*12.6*	*23.4*	—	—	—	—	8.1	5.0	—	—	16.3	1.1	*0.1*	*0.9*	—	—
	III	*14.7*	*30.6*	—	—	—	—	*2.2*	*3.3*	—	—	*18.3*	*1.0*	*0.3*	*1.8*	—	—
	IV	*32.4*	*24.4*	—	—	—	—	*3.3*	*3.3*	—	—	*13.1*	*1.2*	*0.4*	*1.5*	—	—

EXTERNAL TRADE

7. DIRECTION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE *(Cont'd)*

Quarterly averages or quarters — *Million dollars*

Area of origin for imports and area of destination for exports	Year and Quarter	JAPAN Exp.	JAPAN Imp.	KOREA, Republic of Exp.	KOREA, Republic of Imp.[c]	LAOS Exp.	LAOS Imp.	PAKISTAN Exp.	PAKISTAN Imp.	PHILIPPINES Exp.	PHILIPPINES Imp.[e]	SINGAPORE Exp.	SINGAPORE Imp.	THAILAND[c] Exp.	THAILAND[c] Imp.	VIET-NAM[f] Exp.
7. North America	1953	65.2	242.4	7.6	27.8	...	...	7.4	4.2	69.6	90.6	24.1	10.3	17.7	14.6	...
	1954	83.2	266.0	3.5	23.0	...	...	6.1	6.2	62.4	85.4	25.3	11.9	14.0	11.5	...
	1955	134.8	255.5	1.8	62.1	—	0.3	8.4	8.6	60.3	93.6	37.9	11.8	26.6	13.4	4.0
	1956	164.5	358.6	2.7	82.1	—	0.9	8.5	6.8	61.0	79.2	28.0	15.1	21.0	14.9	2.1
	1957	183.5	495.6	1.0	98.6	—	1.5	9.8	34.4	56.7	88.5	27.0	12.6	18.3	17.9	2.8
	1958	214.6	339.4	0.7	83.0	—	0.9	8.3	31.0	68.2	76.2	19.4	10.6	14.4	17.5	1.3
	1959	315.5	372.4	0.6	37.8	—	0.5	9.8	25.8	73.6	61.9	30.2	11.2	22.2	18.9	1.6
	1960	*337.4*	*479.3*	*0.9*	*35.8*	—	*0.3*	*9.7*	*44.2*	*68.1*	*67.5*	*25.0*	*14.1*	*14.3*	*19.5*	*0.9*
	1960 I	318.4	487.3	0.8	27.3	—	0.6	10.6	40.1	60.7	68.9	32.7	10.9	19.5	19.9	0.4
	II	*346.5*	*462.5*	*1.1*	32.6	—	*0.4*	9.6	48.0	*94.7*	*75.6*	26.5	15.2	*12.3*	*20.4*	1.4
	III	*336.9*	*491.1*	*1.1*	*29.2*	—	*0.3*	*6.5*	*45.3*	*55.5*	*67.4*	*22.9*	*15.7*	*11.8*	*20.5*	*1.3*
	IV	*362.3*	*477.9*	*0.7*	*37.3*			*12.2*	*43.2*	*61.5*	*57.9*	*19.1*	*14.4*	*13.7*	*17.7*	*0.6*
8. United States of America	1953	58.5	189.4	7.6	24.0[d]	...	...	7.2	4.1	69.0	87.8	20.2	9.5	17.5	14.2	...
	1954	70.7	212.3	3.5	21.9[d]	...	...	6.0	5.2	61.6	81.6	21.2	10.9	13.6	11.0	...
	1955	114.3	193.5	1.8	60.9[d]	—	0.3	7.7	8.0	60.0	89.0	32.4	10.7	26.2	12.8	4.0
	1956	137.9	266.8	2.7	81.2[d]	—	0.9	7.8	6.5	60.6	75.1	23.2	13.5	20.8	14.2	2.1
	1957	151.6	406.6	1.0	98.5[d]	—	1.5	9.6	30.1	56.2	84.3	22.4	11.4	18.1	16.9	2.8
	1958	173.1	264.4	0.7	82.5[d]	—	0.9	7.9	27.0	67.6	73.2	15.8	9.5	14.0	16.8	1.3
	1959	262.8	279.0	0.6	35.5	—	0.4	8.3	20.9	73.2	57.9	23.8	10.2	22.2	17.6	1.6
	1960	*275.0*	*386.8*	*0.9*	*33.4*	—	*0.3*	*8.6*	*40.7*	*67.8*	*64.2*	*19.8*	*12.8*	*14.3*	*18.9*	*0.9*
	1960 I	266.4	397.1	0.8	24.8	—	0.6	9.9	35.1	60.5	65.7	25.1	9.8	19.5	19.1	0.4
	II	*281.8*	*386.2*	1.1	30.5	—	*0.4*	8.6	46.4	*94.3*	*72.1*	21.3	13.7	*12.1*	*19.9*	1.4
	III	275.4	396.8	*1.1*	*28.3*	—	*0.3*	*5.3*	*43.4*	55.0	63.0	18.0	14.3	*11.9*	*19.8*	*1.3*
	IV	*278.4*	*367.5*	*0.7*	*36.3*			*10.5*	*37.7*	*61.4*	*55.8*	*14.7*	*13.2*	*13.6*	*16.9*	*0.6*
9. Latin American Republics	1953	26.1	66.2	—	0.5	...	...	0.5	—	2.8	0.2	3.7	0.1	—	—	...
	1954	50.3	77.2	—	0.3	...	...	0.9	—	3.0	0.7	4.9	0.2	0.1	—	...
	1955	44.8	60.7	—	0.3	—	—	1.6	—	3.6	0.7	8.1	0.2	0.2	—	—
	1956	41.0	87.3	—	0.2	—	—	0.9	—	3.8	1.2	4.9	0.4	0.2	—	—
	1957	37.3	77.1	—	—	—	—	1.2	2.8	3.6	0.9	9.2	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1
	1958	48.4	64.7	—	—	—	—	0.8	0.4	2.6	1.2	5.6	0.3	—	0.1	—
	1959	56.0	81.3	—	0.1	—	—	1.9	—	2.5	1.4	7.3	0.2	0.1	—	—
	1960	*69.4*	*76.9*	—	—	—	—	*1.8*	—	*2.5*	*1.4*	*7.8*	*0.3*	—	*0.8*	—
	1960 I	58.2	58.9	—	—	—	—	1.5	—	2.6	1.2	9.6	0.2	0.4	—	—
	II	72.5	*66.1*	—	—	—	—	*1.1*	—	*2.8*	*1.7*	7.7	0.3	—	*0.5*	—
	III	*66.5*	*82.7*	—	—	—	—	*2.5*	—	*4.1*	*1.5*	*7.8*	*0.2*	—	*2.1*	—
	IV	*80.1*	*99.9*	—	—	—	—	*2.2*	—	*0.5*	*1.0*	*6.2*	*0.5*	—	*0.4*	—
10. Oceania	1953	3.6	50.2	—	3.4	...	...	1.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	15.5	7.4	—	1.0	...
	1954	8.8	34.0	—	0.7	...	...	1.6	0.5	0.2	0.8	15.3	7.2	—	0.6	...
	1955	17.2	50.8	—	0.2	—	—	1.4	0.6	0.3	1.3	17.4	7.8	0.1	0.8	—
	1956	10.8	71.6	—	0.1	—	—	0.6	0.6	0.3	1.4	19.8	9.1	0.1	1.0	—
	1957	14.6	109.4	—	—	—	—	0.5	4.6	0.2	2.7	16.1	10.2	0.2	1.2	—
	1958	19.9	65.0	—	0.2	—	—	0.6	0.9	0.2	2.8	11.5	9.0	0.2	1.0	—
	1959	25.5	84.9	—	2.0	—	0.1	1.8	0.9	0.3	2.8	12.8	9.5	0.4	1.1	—
	1960	*42.0*	*95.0*	—	*2.0*	—	—	*2.5*	*3.6*	*0.4*	*2.3*	*15.6*	*9.2*	*0.3*	*1.2*	—
	1960 I	26.0	98.9	—	2.0	—	—	1.6	2.4	0.4	1.9	15.2	9.5	0.6	1.0	—
	II	*37.6*	*93.6*	—	2.0	—	—	1.4	3.5	*0.3*	*2.7*	16.1	10.2	*0.2*	*1.5*	—
	III	*52.1*	*96.1*	—	*7.4*	—	—	*3.2*	*4.0*	*0.7*	*2.5*	*15.8*	*10.1*	*0.3*	*1.0*	—
	IV	*56.1*	*96.8*	—	*2.2*	—	—	*3.7*	*4.4*	*0.3*	*1.9*	*15.0*	*7.1*	*0.4*	*1.4*	—
11. Sterling area	1953	79.0	150.6	0.8	7.4	...	...	37.0	23.4	2.3	6.0	67.3	71.8	39.9	30.3	...
	1954	122.8	108.4	0.7	10.8	...	...	33.6	32.6	2.4	10.2	70.1	69.6	32.1	22.5	...
	1955	160.2	147.2	0.5	5.0	—	0.4	38.5	25.9	2.6	12.1	85.3	79.1	35.7	26.7	2.4
	1956	171.2	204.4	0.7	2.2	0.1	1.7	32.4	20.7	4.0	12.4	84.8	87.3	38.8	40.0	0.6
	1957	201.7	280.4	1.2	1.2	0.1	2.0	30.3	37.6	3.8	17.2	78.1	82.3	43.9	35.9	1.4
	1958	199.9	197.8	0.5	1.6	0.1	1.3	24.9	29.4	2.6	14.6	62.2	84.2	38.7	33.0	2.1
	1959	215.0	276.4	0.5	6.4	3.5	3.3	36.1	25.5	4.0	13.7	66.4	76.0	42.6	32.2	3.8
	1960	*276.3*	*278.8*	*1.3*	*6.6*	*4.6*	*2.6*	*44.6*	*45.9*	*5.6*	*18.2*	*74.0*	*82.0*	*47.5*	*32.1*	*4.3*
	1960 I	221.0	320.9	1.3	7.0	9.3	0.6	44.1	36.0	4.1	15.3	72.1	80.6	49.7	30.4	3.9
	II	*260.1*	*282.4*	1.1	5.8	*7.9*	*8.3*	47.5	44.6	*8.0*	*21.0*	77.0	86.7	*43.8*	*33.9*	5.0
	III	*292.4*	*279.2*	*0.7*	5.5	*1.2*	*1.6*	*33.5*	*45.5*	*6.2*	*21.0*	*73.3*	*81.6*	*51.7*	*32.3*	*6.3*
	IV	*339.8*	*274.2*	*1.9*	7.9			*53.4*	*57.6*	*4.2*	*15.5*	*73.6*	*78.9*	*43.8*	*31.4*	*4.3*
12. ECAFE sterling countries[a]	1953	47.8	82.1	0.7	3.3	...	...	13.2	6.6	0.6	4.5	26.0	29.0	37.8	19.1	...
	1954	72.0	60.2	0.6	8.5	...	...	11.6	6.3	0.7	6.7	27.2	21.2	28.0	13.7	...
	1955	87.3	74.6	1.0	3.8	—	0.2	16.9	5.5	0.7	7.3	25.5	31.7	31.6	17.0	1.9
	1956	99.2	92.2	0.5	1.6	—	1.3	13.8	4.6	1.6	7.1	29.1	34.6	34.5	26.6	0.6
	1957	111.0	105.2	1.0	0.9	0.1	1.4	12.0	11.1	1.4	8.2	30.9	31.4	38.0	21.9	1.3
	1958	94.9	78.0	0.3	0.8	0.1	0.9	5.4	10.4	0.6	5.6	23.8	31.9	31.5	21.2	1.8
	1959	101.5	101.0	0.3	2.2	3.5	0.4	11.2	7.6	1.3	4.8	24.6	32.3	34.8	19.8	3.0
	1960	*134.7*	*112.4*	*0.8*	*2.4*	*4.6*	*0.4*	*16.9*	*11.0*	*1.6*	*7.2*	*28.7*	*36.6*	*43.9*	*18.7*	*3.2*
	1960 I	108.3	114.2	1.0	1.8	9.3	0.4	19.5	6.9	0.7	6.4	26.9	34.6	42.9	19.1	2.0
	II	*132.8*	*120.8*	0.6	2.0	*7.9*	*0.7*	20.5	8.6	*2.5*	*7.9*	28.2	35.1	*38.9*	*18.8*	3.9
	III	*138.5*	*125.1*	*0.4*	*2.1*	*1.2*	*0.5*	*14.2*	8.5	*2.1*	7.5	*28.1*	*37.3*	*41.9*	*17.9*	*4.7*
	IV	*159.0*	89.5	*1.1*	*3.6*			*13.6*	*20.0*	*0.9*	6.9	29.8	*32.7*	*52.1*	*19.1*	*3.0*

b. Figures for trade with the Netherlands are as follows:—

	Exp.	Imp.			Exp.	Imp.
1953	48.4	22.4	1959	I	2.9	4.2
1954	41.3	16.4		II	2.9	2.8
1955	37.7	17.7		III	1.9	4.8
1956	42.9	22.8		IV	1.5	*5.4*
1957	40.7	19.6	1960	I	0.6	3.8
1958	7.8	8.3		II	0.4	*4.9*
1959	2.3	*4.3*		III	*0.6*	*3.4*

c. Figures prior to 1955 for Republic of Korea and 1956 for Thailand are derived from trade returns of partner countries. Totals for geographical and currency areas may not be complete.

d. Including some imports of aid goods from countries other than the United States.

e. Imports valued f.o.b.

f. See footnote g to table 6.

8. VALUE OF IMPORTS BY PRINCIPAL COMMODITY GROUPS

Monthly averages or calendar months — *Millions*

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
BRUNEI *(Malayan dollar)*													
Food	1.40	1.35	1.16	1.10	1.06	1.11	1.13	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	0.24	0.21	0.29	0.25	0.21	0.17	0.18	...	...	...	...	...	...
Chemicals	0.32	0.34	0.42	0.41	0.29	0.35	0.30	...	...	...	...	...	...
Textiles	0.15	0.21	0.17	0.15	0.10	0.11	0.10	...	...	...	...	...	...
Machinery	1.30	1.46	1.55	1.11	0.68	0.72	0.86	...	...	...	...	...	...
Transport equipment	0.51	0.70	0.58	0.55	0.34	0.23	0.26	...	...	...	...	...	...
Other manufactured goods	3.29	3.93	3.25	2.40	1.89	1.93	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
BURMA *(kyat)*													
Food	8.0	6.8	10.9	10.0	10.0	...	...	10.8	...	...	...	...	...
Chemicals	5.4	7.1	10.3	5.4	6.5	...	...	9.8	...	...	...	...	...
Textiles	16.6	22.4	33.0	15.8	22.9	...	32.0	38.6	...	...	...	...	...
Base metals and manufactures	8.4	6.9	14.1	9.8	9.2	*11.1*	10.7	9.1	*12.4*	*11.9*	*11.2*	*7.3*	*8.8*
Machinery	7.3	10.1	12.0	15.7	12.7	*17.1*	18.7	9.4	*16.4*	*19.3*	*16.3*	*10.0*	*10.8*
Transport equipment	5.7	6.3	11.2	6.7	6.5	...	...	7.0					
Other manufactured goods	9.3	9.7	13.9	9.2	9.7	...	...	10.8	...	...	...	...	...
CAMBODIA *(riel)*													
Food	15.1	16.5	20.5	22.5	24.8	*25.7*	20.6	25.3	24.0	*28.3*	*25.2*	...	...
Beverages and tobacco	9.0	5.2	6.7	8.0	6.8	*8.1*	8.8	8.1	8.8	*7.0*	*8.5*	...	...
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	11.8	9.9	5.3	3.5	25.5	*18.0*	18.2	17.5	6.5	*27.8*	*20.1*	...	...
Textiles	27.8	33.4	35.0	40.1	25.0	*61.3*	35.2	91.5	49.9	*52.2*	*51.7*	...	...
Base metals and manufactures	13.1	13.6	20.0	23.4	26.0	*35.3*	26.5	62.8	23.7	*23.1*	*31.8*	...	...
Machinery	11.3	16.1	11.9	29.0	20.6	*35.7*	30.5	45.1	35.6	*25.3*	*36.8*	...	...
Transport equipment	8.7	9.7	9.1	22.6	13.3	*25.6*	20.5	21.4	25.8	*23.4*	*31.9*	...	...
CEYLON *(rupee)*													
Food	50.3	58.7	59.4	57.8	65.7	61.8	71.0	59.6	50.7	79.3	57.6	63.7	35.3
Cereals and cereal preparations	26.1	28.3	29.0	26.0	33.0	26.0	33.4	24.0	19.0	38.5	22.6	22.1	9.6
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	12.0	10.6	18.7	11.8	12.6	12.0	11.4	16.7	11.2	12.6	7.6	14.1	8.1
Chemicals	7.6	8.2	10.1	8.7	11.2	10.7	12.3	10.9	11.5	10.1	10.3	10.2	8.9
Textiles	11.3	13.4	13.6	15.1	14.2	15.5	17.3	14.2	14.8	15.5	17.3	18.0	13.0
Machinery	7.1	8.7	9.5	10.6	12.8	11.5	13.0	10.8	11.0	11.2	13.2	12.9	11.5
Transport equipment	5.9	6.9	7.3	8.9	14.7	12.9	16.2	15.7	16.6	11.0	8.1	8.3	10.0
Other manufactured goods	21.8	25.1	25.3	24.1	30.2	33.7	35.0	32.2	34.6	34.7	33.2	30.1	26.8
CHINA: Taiwan *(new Taiwan dollar)*													
Food	26.6	42.2	33.6	46.7	49.6	83.7	71.9	*48.4*	144.1	33.7	106.8	...	...
Crude materials, inedible, except fuels	63.5	92.1	107.4	93.0	138.5	195.8	116.0	136.5	182.7	191.4	248.0	...	...
Oil-seeds, oil nuts and oil kernels	19.0	23.3	25.0	20.4	28.8	43.1	21.8	24.3	30.2	51.7	66.1	...	...
Textile fibres, raw	31.8	37.1	43.7	41.8	55.6	82.4	42.7	64.5	90.5	80.9	90.0	...	...
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	21.3	26.2	46.3	36.6	49.0	68.1	40.2	71.7	84.0	29.6	59.3	...	...
Chemicals	44.8	75.7	62.1	103.2	146.1	137.7	121.6	129.3	109.1	192.3	144.8	...	...
Base metals and manufactures	25.9	45.7	48.0	47.9	77.9	87.3	73.2	67.6	89.6	113.3	76.8	...	...
Machinery	43.8	60.6	74.9	76.2	134.0	187.1	123.5	100.6	278.9	235.6	127.0	...	...
Transport equipment	8.0	14.2	16.6	23.3	39.1	56.0	56.0	30.5	92.2	58.1	43.3	...	...
Other manufactured goods	21.4	30.6	37.3	28.9	42.2	59.8	43.4	64.7	53.1	56.0	73.9	...	...
FEDERATION OF MALAYA[b] *(Malayan dollar)*													
Food	39.8	43.7	44.0	44.0	42.5	46.5	45.7	44.7	45.1	49.1	47.1	46.1	*45.3*
Cereals and cereal preparations	14.5	15.6	15.5	15.8	15.6	...	17.7	14.1	15.9	19.1	...	...	...
Crude materials, inedible, except fuels	14.1	16.5	17.3	15.2	17.6	28.3	23.7	28.0	26.9	31.4	26.8	20.7	*18.5*
Metal ores and scrap	5.3	5.9	7.3	4.4	5.1	...	6.3	6.8	10.6	16.6	...	...	...
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	10.5	11.3	12.5	11.2	10.7	12.4	10.8	10.7	13.4	14.1	11.6	15.1	*9.6*
Textiles	8.9	8.3	8.4	7.3	8.3	...	9.5	11.0	8.7	9.7	...	...	...
Machinery	8.3	10.6	11.7	10.4	11.7	27.5	15.4	14.0	14.7	15.8	30.4	31.9	*27.3*
Transport equipment	6.2	8.6	8.6	8.0	8.4		10.0	10.3	12.7	11.9			
Other manufactured goods	23.7	26.8	27.3	22.5	24.5	...	27.4	28.3	28.8	29.6	...	...	...
INDIA *(rupee)*[a]													
Food	94.6	84.7	162.5	1,488	128.9	130.2	*109.2*	*167.5*	*77.1*	*143.7*	*132.4*	...	...
Crude materials, inedible, except fuels	94.2	99.6	93.5	66.7	78.6	125.2	*74.5*	*103.0*	*147.7*	*149.5*	*100.5*	...	...
Cotton raw and waste	44.6	44.7	40.5	25.6	29.0	62.6	*21.8*	*42.3*	*85.6*	*85.7*	*36.9*	...	...
Petroleum and products	78.3	90.4	89.6	63.2	65.0	65.3	*88.9*	*79.1*	*55.8*	*54.4*	*72.1*	...	...
Chemicals	44.0	49.0	64.0	54.4	71.0	71.7	*60.9*	*75.7*	*71.3*	*71.6*	*68.4*	...	...
Base metals and manufactures	69.0	131.2	191.2	125.6	120.2	147.8	*124.7*	*119.1*	*156.8*	*158.7*	*156.6*	...	...
Machinery	76.9	127.5	194.1	157.4	163.5	193.9	*178.6*	*172.7*	*207.7*	*197.8*	*197.6*	...	...
Transport equipment	56.2	64.4	63.2	49.6	58.7	50.2	*46.1*	*45.6*	*59.2*	*46.0*	*50.1*	...	...
Other manufactured goods	68.2	90.8	66.4	43.8	44.3	47.5	*43.1*	*46.7*	*45.9*	*52.6*	*44.9*	...	...
INDONESIA *(rupiah)*													
Live animals, food products, beverages and tobacco	63.2	177.2	133.0	114.8	99.1	*501.9*	142.4	631.1	448.4	*422.0*	*506.0*	...	...
Chemicals and allied products	53.4	55.9	59.9	43.2	50.7	*159.1*	48.1	116.7	115.8	*191.6*	*212.1*	...	...
Textiles, apparel and footware	175.4	202.2	165.8	101.6	84.5	*582.7*	125.8	437.6	620.7	*620.3*	*652.0*	...	...
Base metals and manufactures	72.2	80.4	111.4	53.4	60.4	*211.3*	67.3	138.0	203.2	*188.3*	*315.7*	...	...
Machinery and transport equipment	102.4	145.7	134.7	88.5	82.2[r]	*395.2*	98.8	233.6	442.1	*433.1*	*471.9*	...	...

8. VALUE OF IMPORTS BY PRINCIPAL COMMODITY GROUPS *(Cont'd)*

Monthly averages or calendar months — *Millions*

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
IRAN* *(rial)*[c]		e											
Food, beverages and tobacco	146.3	326.2	371.4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sugar	78.8	189.1	180.1	180.1	*151.2*	...	160.0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tea	58.6	78.6	137.8	124.2	*93.3*	...	90.3	...	...	...	...	...	...
Chemicals	73.6	61.8	88.7	128.5	*198.2*	...	162.7	...	...	...	...	...	...
Textiles	117.3	270.4	312.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Base metals and manufactures	230.5	185.0	288.6	390.2	*483.6*	...	520.0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Machinery	237.2	230.3	298.0	565.2	*861.7*	...	710.0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Transport equipment	129.1	151.4	169.2	279.8	381.7	...	231.7	...	...	...	...	...	...
Other manufactured goods	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
JAPAN *(thousand million yen)*													
Food	18.34	16.47	17.06	15.66	14.50	15.87	13.18	13.93	15.08	17.43	17.01	16.89	17.57
Cereals and cereal preparations	13.20	11.08	9.36	9.43	8.69	8.73	7.45	7.32	8.82	9.67	9.12	8.64	10.15
Sugar and sugar preparations	3.64	4.02	5.08	3.85	3.40	3.64	2.89	4.03	3.17	3.90	3.44	5.13	3.50
Crude materials, inedible, except fuels	36.77	51.31	60.29	38.98	52.04	65.08	58.18	69.90	66.79	64.43	59.40	68.74	70.54
Oil-seeds, oil nuts & oil kernels	4.41	4.01	4.23	4.04	4.93	5.62	4.70	7.57	4.52	5.91	4.49	6.18	6.12
Crude rubber	2.24	2.66	3.05	2.59	4.25	5.31	4.98	6.57	5.37	5.34	3.98	3.50	3.47
Textile fibres, raw	17.57	23.16	23.86	18.23	19.56	22.84	21.14	26.27	25.40	20.07	19.63	26.12	29.25
Metal ores and scrap	5.57	13.70	20.78	7.73	14.89	20.20	17.24	19.10	19.92	21.47	20.29	21.12	20.05
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	8.67	12.38	20.39	15.43	16.69	22.25	19.33	21.25	21.01	22.34	24.43	24.44	25.75
Chemicals	2.41	4.90	5.50	4.99	6.69	7.96	7.47	8.03	7.96	7.56	8.28	8.72	9.79
Machinery	3.29	3.93	7.26	9.11	8.96	9.48	6.89	9.63	8.65	9.44	10.21	10.11	13.15
Transport equipment	0.68	0.92	1.41	1.15	1.64	2.61	1.62	1.71	1.59	3.98	3.15	2.07	3.01
Other manufactured goods	2.41	5.68	15.26	4.42	5.93	9.53	7.18	9.05	10.52	8.85	9.78	10.13	10.88
KOREA, Republic of *(hwan)*[d]													
Food	555	452	922	707	1,266	2,268	1,401	1,597	2,316	2,746	2,418	2,707	2,245
Cereals and cereal preparations	78	65	558	198	855	1,364	799	984	1,457	1,645	1,369	1,913	1,344
Beverages and tobacco	188	220	224	174	1	1	—	1	3	1	—	—	—
Crude materials, inedible, except fuels	115	120	206	440	3,665	5,160	4,295	4,185	5,458	4,878	6,118	5,095	6,001
Chemicals	693	370	325	492	4,281	5,215	3,224	4,075	7,898	4,813	4,075	4,288	5,055
Textiles	1,273	663	345	392	1,082	1,531	1,363	1,319	1,238	1,699	1,867	1,456	1,400
Machinery	276	254	262	309	1,460	1,834	2,149	1,388	2,200	1,762	1,988	2,045	2,585
Transport equipment	52	79	48	42	308	76	40	42	32	37	194	38	45
Other manufactured goods	862	711	711	889	1,879	2,852	1,836	2,209	3,229	2,845	3,124	2,129	2,315
LAOS *(kip)*													
Food	15.2	18.0	17.0	16.5	19.8	22.2	24.9	25.5	32.3	15.5		...	...
Cereals and cereal preparations	7.4	10.5	6.2	3.4	3.3	5.6	6.3	5.9	6.3	5.0		...	...
Petroleum products	2.3	4.0	4.8	8.5	14.9	17.1	17.5	21.7	26.2	10.2		...	...
Chemicals	2.9	5.6	8.4	4.5	4.7	4.3	6.7	4.3	7.5	2.6		...	...
Textiles	9.1	23.0	26.0	11.6	11.7	6.5	12.3	9.2	8.8	4.0		...	...
Machinery	3.9	6.9	7.8	8.3	8.9	7.1	5.8	11.6	8.4	4.2		...	...
Transport equipment	3.5	12.0	18.7	10.1	6.9	4.1	5.2	7.8	5.0	1.8		...	...
Other manufactured goods	11.5	24.6	28.1	16.5	57.7	13.0	12.6	22.2	18.1	5.9		...	...
NORTH BORNEO *(Malayan dollar)*													
Food	1.89	2.54	2.33	2.53	2.43	2.92	2.57	2.53	2.80	2.99	3.38	...	...
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	0.44	0.51	0.48	0.40	1.43	1.34	1.62	1.28	1.13	1.44	1.53	...	...
Chemicals	0.32	0.41	0.44	0.44	0.58	0.65	0.63	0.56	0.74	0.59	0.70	...	...
Textiles	0.53	0.69	0.55	0.47	0.50	0.73	0.59	0.67	0.68	0.76	0.78	...	...
Machinery	0.57	0.68	0.89	0.96	1.62	2.43	2.07	2.16	3.03	2.23	2.29	...	...
Transport equipment	0.24	0.51	0.45	0.51	0.56	0.88	0.60	0.72	1.07	0.79	0.95	...	...
Other manufactured goods	1.59	2.01	2.02	1.96	2.24	2.82	2.52	2.34	2.76	2.90	3.26	...	...
PAKISTAN *(rupee)*[e]													
Mineral oils	9.5	8.3	7.4	7.3	13.9	25.1	21.9	17.8	27.1	23.6	32.0	25.0	18.0
Chemicals	7.0	8.5	10.5	10.8	9.0	16.6	14.7	11.0	18.0	17.3	20.2	19.5	15.4
Iron and steel manufactures	8.3	15.5	18.8	19.7	14.2	27.7	17.3	23.6	22.5	28.7	36.2	32.2	30.8
Machinery	20.8	26.3	26.5	26.2	28.2	51.9	30.5	53.8	71.7	39.3	42.8	46.2	31.1
Transport equipment	4.1	7.7	9.5	10.7	9.4	17.2	12.0	11.5	17.6	16.5	23.1	28.3	19.0
PHILIPPINES *(peso)*[f]													
Food	17.1	14.7	18.0	19.6	11.4	14.2	13.5	14.0	16.2	15.5	11.3	16.0	13.2
Cereals and cereal preparations	6.2	4.4	6.3	8.7	3.9	4.1	5.2	4.0	4.6	5.1	2.7	2.9	2.6
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	9.0	8.7	9.6	10.2	9.9	8.0	11.2	9.2	9.6	7.1	6.1	10.1	5.7
Chemicals	7.3	6.5	9.5	8.5	9.8	9.1	12.0	9.9	9.3	7.8	9.5	10.5	7.7
Textiles	14.2	9.9	12.9	9.0	6.4	5.1	7.7	5.2	5.4	5.0	4.9	4.1	5.0
Machinery	12.4	16.1	18.0	16.3	17.9	17.4	19.9	18.7	19.7	16.1	15.1	24.0	18.4
Transport equipment	5.0	4.8	5.6	4.8	4.6	16.1	4.5	5.3	5.7	17.7	35.6	20.4	11.5
Other manufactured goods	21.7	20.1	24.7	19.7	19.2	19.5	21.8	17.5	22.9	19.2	18.6	15.5	14.7
SARAWAK *(Malayan dollar)*							i						
Food	4.32	4.36	4.57	4.04	4.65	4.95	5.35	4.69	4.99	5.62	4.81	...	...
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	24.93	26.80	27.38	25.87	25.42	20.92	24.92	22.48	21.21	20.48	19.53	...	...
Chemicals	0.82	0.79	0.80	0.83	0.97	1.26	1.12	1.21	1.30	1.30	1.24	...	...
Textiles	0.61	0.54	0.47	0.42	0.61	0.78	0.63	0.84	0.95	0.74	0.57	...	...
Machinery	1.21	1.20	1.20	1.03	1.42	1.59	1.59	1.62	1.69	1.44	1.61	...	...
Transport equipment	0.37	0.45	0.38	0.36	0.37	0.58	0.45	0.54	0.48	0.66	0.67	...	...
Other manufactured goods	2.37	2.38	2.13	2.00	2.49	2.85	2.67	2.67	3.09	2.69	2.93	...	...

8. VALUE OF IMPORTS BY PRINCIPAL COMMODITY GROUPS (Cont'd)

Monthly averages or calendar months — *Millions*

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
SINGAPORE (*Malayan dollar*)[g]													
Food	45.2	50.5	50.0	53.2	48.4	49.8	52.8	52.1	43.9	47.2	56.1	...	...
Cereals and cereal preparations	11.7	13.3	12.1	15.9	11.1	12.5	11.7	11.6	11.8	12.1	14.4	...	...
Crude materials, inedible, except fuels	59.5	54.9	57.0	50.8	72.9	70.8	86.3	85.4	76.3	60.9	60.7	...	...
Crude rubber	51.0	46.4	45.6	41.2	62.6	60.5	77.5	75.6	66.1	51.4	48.7	...	...
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	50.0	59.1	65.2	55.8	50.0	49.3	45.2	43.3	49.2	54.7	49.8	...	...
Textiles	17.9	17.9	17.6	22.0	18.0	18.4	17.2	19.5	17.4	17.2	19.5	...	...
Machinery	10.3	12.2	13.5	12.3	11.4	13.6	11.4	13.1	13.3	14.4	13.5	...	...
Transport equipment	6.2	7.6	9.0	7.8	6.3	8.5	6.8	7.0	10.7	7.8	8.6	...	...
Other manufactured goods	30.2	34.1	37.7	33.3	31.0	35.9	29.5	33.8	35.0	34.8	39.9	...	...
THAILAND (*baht*)													
Food	51.5	55.2	57.8	65.1	61.0	59.4	62.0	51.9	57.9	63.7	64.1	56.5	...
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	57.0	64.6	77.3	75.1	78.7	85.5	94.5	74.4	92.4	97.3	78.0	94.8	...
Chemicals	48.1	54.5	62.8	63.1	76.5	80.4	75.1	71.5	85.9	83.0	81.3	86.6	...
Textiles	113.4	120.3	113.7	102.0	115.8	111.1	126.0	115.2	91.4	107.5	130.3	131.6	...
Machinery	65.3	73.8	85.2	93.6	124.5	124.6	156.6	155.7	111.9	102.9	127.9	125.4	...
Transport equipment	48.7	53.1	73.7	61.4	58.8	68.1	48.1	60.9	76.1	81.5	53.9	80.1	...
Other manufactured goods	191.1	173.8	189.7	184.1	184.4	195.3	175.8	213.3	185.3	189.9	192.9	191.1	...
VIET-NAM (*piastre*)[h]													
Food	89.6	82.2	75.9	69.5	69.2	77.2	88.5	84.5	73.3	79.5	72.6	...	...
Petroleum and products	33.7	35.0	44.6	46.8	51.8	48.8	56.7	49.9	68.4	41.7	35.1	...	...
Textiles	111.2	123.5	128.7	108.5	73.9	76.6	84.6	74.5	55.2	60.3	116.4	...	...
Machinery	65.4	49.2	83.9	63.0	75.2	89.5	101.8	84.0	101.3	82.5	99.0	...	...
Transport equipment	52.3	32.6	58.3	53.4	42.0	42.8	54.6	39.9	39.2	34.2	57.8	...	...

GENERAL NOTE: See table 6.

a. 1955 to 1956 figures, reclassified by ECAFE Secretariat, may not conform exactly to the new classification beginning from 1957.

b. Including trade with Singapore.

c. Prior to 1956, transaction values converted from foreign currency to rials at the official rate of exchange and excluding the value of exchange certificates; beginning 1956, including the value of exchange certificates.

d. Figures for 1955-1958, excluding foreign aid. From 1959 onwards figures including foreign aid.

e. Figures including government account, except 1955 figures relating to private account only.

f. Imports valued f.o.b.

g. Excluding trade with the Federation of Malaya.

h. See footnote g to table 6.

i. Averages of Jul-Dec for Sarawak column 1959 IV.

9. VALUE OF EXPORTS BY PRINCIPAL COMMODITIES AND/OR COMMODITY GROUPS

Monthly averages or calendar months — *Millions*

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
BRUNEI (*Malayan dollar*)													
Crude petroleum	23.91	25.78	26.14	25.04	24.38	20.01	23.40	21.57	20.34	19.50	18.61	...	...
Natural rubber	0.33	0.35	0.20	0.18	0.34	0.47	0.45	...	...	...	...	...	...
BURMA (*kyat*)													
Rice and products	68.1	72.3	66.7	56.9	62.8	60.1	58.7	84.7	86.4	48.5	20.9	21.8	37.7
Natural rubber	2.7	3.7	3.1	2.2	3.0	...	2.5	4.7	0.6	...	...	...	...
Teak	1.8	2.8	5.6	4.3	5.7	8.0	6.2	5.9	7.8	9.4	8.7	9.2	8.1
Raw cotton	3.2	4.3	2.1	1.3	1.8	3.1	1.7	4.1	3.4	1.9	2.9	...	...
Base metals and ores	4.9	5.2	3.9	2.9	3.5	3.1	3.7	2.9	2.9	3.8	2.6	0.8	1.0
CAMBODIA (*riel*)													
Rice	9.3	20.6	55.8	64.6	67.1	67.6	63.4	67.1	48.8	96.2	58.4	...	...
Maize	12.5	15.9	14.8	18.7	18.1	24.1	36.6	24.0	12.5	27.1	33.0	...	...
Natural rubber	51.1	42.2	47.7	51.2	57.9	81.5	40.8	62.9	47.9	89.4	125.7	...	...
CEYLON (*rupee*)													
Tea	99.5	87.0	85.1	94.2	87.1	91.3	97.4	93.7	89.8	94.2	87.6	99.1	75.0
Coconut and products	19.0	18.0	13.3	13.6	20.3	15.3	22.4	12.7	14.7	19.1	14.6	16.0	13.4
Natural rubber	29.2	24.4	25.0	21.5	24.8	31.5	25.1	48.0	27.0	20.3	30.8	23.2	29.4
CHINA (Taiwan, *new Taiwan dollar*)													
Rice	37.3	34.4	37.0	54.4	70.9	15.3	91.0	4.1	48.4	—	8.7	...	...
Fruits, fresh, dried and preserved	12.3	18.4	16.2	26.3	43.5	46.3	41.2	32.0	54.8	61.0	37.3	...	...
Tea	7.0	10.2	11.8	13.1	21.0	17.4	37.2	19.1	12.5	19.0	19.0	...	...
Sugar	79.6	127.6	191.0	166.8	193.4	223.6	125.3	267.7	263.4	108.4	254.7	...	...
FEDERATION OF MALAYA[a] (*Malayan dollar*)													
Natural rubber	132.0	114.8	108.7	99.8	143.5	152.4	174.7	169.4	156.2	147.9	136.2	102.5	120.8
Iron ore	2.7	4.3	5.5	5.2	8.3	11.7	7.3	7.2	15.2	15.9	8.4	6.8	5.5
Vegetable oils	7.2	8.3	7.7	7.3	6.8	7.0	7.2	7.0	6.4	75	7.2	3.5	7.6
Tin metal	19.3	28.4	26.6	19.7	24.5	42.1	29.3	36.8	34.3	48.5	49.0	41.4	28.2
INDIA (*rupee*)[b]													
Food	131.2	157.6	[b] 149.3	160.3	161.8	160.9	230.7	149.4	99.8	161.0	233.6	194.8	...
Tea	94.3	118.5	102.8	113.8	105.3	100.0	165.9	77.4	41.1	114.0	167.7	124.9	...
Spices	8.8	7.7	7.0	7.4	8.5	14.7	13.8	21.1	12.4	10.2	15.0	13.4	...
Crude materials, inedible, except fuels	98.3	84.2	103.8	85.1	97.7	92.6	101.5	99.1	107.1	68.3	95.7	87.1	...
Hides and skins, undressed	5.6	5.1	5.8	6.0	8.9	8.4	10.3	10.6	10.0	5.3	7.9	5.4	...
Cotton raw and waste	28.9	20.9	15.6	17.7	13.6	8.9	9.7	9.7	9.1	5.8	11.0	5.8	...
Vegetable oils	31.2	17.4	9.5	6.2	11.6	8.3	21.3	7.2	13.3	7.1	5.3	3.6	...
Chemicals	4.1	4.5	4.6	3.7	4.1	5.8	4.6	5.1	4.9	6.6	6.5	6.1	...
Leather and manufactures	19.0	18.7	18.1	15.3	24.0	21.5	27.7	23.7	22.8	18.8	20.6	19.5	...
Cotton yarn and fabrics	53.0	51.9	57.2	43.9	55.1	52.4	75.8	55.5	51.1	50.8	52.3	59.8	...
Jute yarn and fabrics	102.9	94.6	49.6	49.6	55.5	62.4	56.1	54.2	63.6	64.7	70.4	65.7	...
Other manufactured goods	31.3	30.9	109.7	81.1	75.2	87.1	85.4	69.6	89.6	95.5	93.6	87.9	...

9. VALUE OF EXPORTS BY PRINCIPAL COMMODITIES AND/OR COMMODITY GROUPS *(Cont'd)*

Monthly averages or calendar months — *Millions*

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
INDONESIA *(rupiah)*													
Tea	29.7	28.3	28.4	23.6	19.2	104.0	20.0	108.8	105.9	99.0	102.2	47.3	...
Copra	40.4	43.3	42.9	19.9	30.2	127.2	56.3	150.9	97.4	92.0	165.7	47.9	...
Natural rubber	410.0	342.7	332.0	248.2	396.6	1,414.6	514.5	1,543.8	1,645.6	1,255.6	1,208.6	705.0	...
Tin ore	56.9	60.5	52.9	35.9	34.0	189.6	40.4	190.8	196.8	190.9	189.1	107.8	...
Petroleum and products	205.0	242.5	287.7	268.2	219.8	827.9	99.3	817.9	752.9	790.1	959.6	197.1	...
IRAN* *(rials)*													
Fruits, fresh, dried and preserved	97.8	113.2	124.7	135.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Raw cotton	139.5	139.7	160.4	124.5	*139.6*	...	232.0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Petroleum and products	783.8	1,325.7	1,608.1	1,904.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Carpets, hand made	104.7	105.3	123.2	110.4	*123.1*	...	143.0	...	...	...	...	...	...
JAPAN *(thousand million yen)*													
Food	3.98	5.32	5.36	6.92	7.63	7.83	9.79	6.63	6.84	7.29	10.57	6.09	7.12
Fish and fish preparations	2.27	3.62	3.66	5.13	5.35	5.24	7.31	4.08	4.36	4.74	7.77	3.23	4.59
Crude materials, inedible except fuels	2.94	2.86	2.79	2.27	3.28	3.69	4.24	3.08	3.63	4.08	4.02	2.29	3.26
Textile fibres, raw	1.74	1.65	1.74	1.13	1.98	2.37	2.89	1.88	2.23	2.74	2.61	1.43	2.03
Chemicals	2.82	3.21	3.79	4.13	5.01	5.08	4.94	5.25	5.21	5.23	4.62	3.83	4.76
Textiles	17.55	20.81	24.44	21.17	22.78	27.71	27.49	23.48	25.08	27.98	34.32	18.18	25.85
Base metals and manufactures	11.61	10.24	9.70	11.15	12.05	16.84	14.54	13.19	15.80	17.89	20.48	13.78	15.84
Machinery	3.83	5.07	6.21	7.08	11.16	14.93	15.34	12.08	14.57	15.68	17.38	10.50	15.75
Transport equipment	3.57	9.56	12.75	11.91	13.34	12.99	14.88	13.15	10.27	13.60	14.94	17.45	12.18
Other manufactured goods	12.97	16.76	20.12	20.10	27.00	30.61	32.17	26.64	32.29	32.43	31.07	20.38	26.76
KOREA, Republic of *(hwan)*													
Food	43	58	152	159	251	883	247	256	5.49	784	1,943	901	388
Crude materials, inedible except fuels	566	842	586	590	744	1,324	493	685	1,274	1,633	1,705	1,074	1,634
Chemicals	47	36	24	1	11	35	16	30	34	33	42	47	27
Manufactured goods	65	108	169	165	161	351	194	187	533	417	267	595	382
LAOS *(kip)*													
Wood and lumber	1.00	0.28	0.13	0.58	1.07	0.29	0.96	0.12	0.32	0.36		...	...
Tin ore	0.75	1.34	1.50	1.60	2.11	2.78	2.23	3.42	3.57	2.06		...	...
Gums and resins	0.59	0.74	0.63	0.49	0.29	0.32	0.20	0.41	0.32	0.27		...	...
Plants for use in medicine and perfumery	0.09	0.24	0.13	0.58	0.84	0.49	0.31	0.51	0.13	0.66		...	...
NORTH BORNEO *(Malayan dollar)*													
Copra	1.18	1.94	2.00	2.68	2.93	3.35	3.35	3.15	3.94	3.57	2.75	...	...
Rubber	3.84	3.36	3.10	2.74	3.92	4.13	5.02	4.26	4.42	4.03	3.80	...	...
Timber	1.81	2.18	2.63	3.03	5.09	7.56	6.52	6.08	7.46	7.21	9.49	...	...
PAKISTAN *(rupee)*[c]													
Tea	2.9	4.5	2.0	2.8	2.4	0.8	5.9	2.8	—	0.1	0.3	...	...
Raw jute	58.0	62.6	65.2	70.0	56.7	66.8	82.3	62.6	56.4	45.7	102.4	129.9	104.6
Raw cotton	33.6	30.3	27.6	20.0	10.1	15.8	4.8	19.5	30.1	9.4	4.4	1.8	27.4
Raw wool	5.6	5.9	8.6	4.0	5.1	6.1	4.5	6.6	10.2	2.4	5.1	4.2	5.7
Hides and skins	2.6	3.3	3.4	3.4	6.8	5.8	5.7	6.8	8.2	4.2	3.8	4.7	4.9
PHILIPPINES *(peso)*													
Coconut and coconut preparations	24.7	28.5	28.1	29.9	29.8	28.9	36.7	28.2	31.7	33.9	21.8	8.4	10.7
Sugar and related products	17.7	16.8	13.8	19.3	18.8	21.2	15.7	19.1	32.4	12.7	20.7	33.5	31.9
Fibres and manufactures	4.6	5.8	6.5	4.8	6.5	7.0	6.8	9.2	6.5	6.0	6.3	7.2	5.4
Minerals and metals	4.3	6.3	6.6	6.1	7.0	7.4	6.2	7.1	8.2	7.7	6.7	7.5	7.6
Logs, lumber and timber	6.9	8.1	7.5	11.6	13.4	14.9	13.5	14.0	18.7	13.0	13.9	9.4	9.6
SARAWAK *(Malayan dollar)*													
Pepper	2.64	2.05	1.44	1.26	1.51	1.43	[g] 2.07	1.17	1.17	1.67	1.73	...	...
Rubber	6.64	5.86	6.20	5.11	8.04	10.24	9.88	10.81	13.97	10.18	5.86	...	...
Timber, sawn and logs	1.83	1.59	1.63	1.63	2.59	3.63	3.06	3.63	3.70	3.38	3.83	...	...
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	26.74	28.85	30.51	27.83	28.26	24.00	27.30	25.52	23.32	22.19	24.97	...	...
SINGAPORE *(Malayan dollar)*[d]													
Rubber	115.9	102.0	95.5	85.8	125.3	116.4	147.7	130.4	131.0	109.8	94.5	...	...
Mineral fuels	31.2	36.2	36.9	30.2	28.6	27.6	25.7	26.3	26.0	25.8	32.5	...	...
Vegetable oils	3.9	3.9	4.7	3.6	3.3	3.9	4.0	3.5	4.4	3.3	4.4	...	...
Tin metal	16.9	11.6	11.1	4.0	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.7	...	...
THAILAND *(baht)*[e]													
Rice	261.1	238.4	301.9	248.0	215.9	215.1	214.6	219.5	221.7	235.7	183.6	384.9	...
Natural rubber	150.2	127.2	117.2	110.6	194.7	215.0	211.8	267.8	206.1	195.4	190.5	126.0	...
Teak	22.0	25.5	21.8	19.9	20.4	29.7	26.9	28.7	35.3	31.0	24.0	18.3	...
Tin ore and concentrates	36.7	42.3	44.3	21.2	36.2	44.9	43.6	47.4	39.9	47.3	44.4	32.9	...
VIET-NAM *(piastre)*[f]													
Rice and products	26.2	1.1	59.3	40.6	69.2	80.2	73.9	76.3	114.3	96.3	33.9	...	...
Natural rubber	122.7	107.0	140.8	103.5	136.8	140.0	220.1	108.5	126.1	194.1	131.2	...	...

GENERAL NOTE: See table 6.

a. Including trade with Singapore.

b. Figures for 1955 to 1956, reclassified by ECAFE Secretariat, may not conform exactly to the new classification from 1957.

c. Figures including government account, except 1955 figures relating to private account only.

d. Excluding trade with the Federation of Malaya.

e. Baht value is obtained by converting foreign currencies at free market buying rate.

f. See footnote g table 6.

g. Averages of Jul-Dec for Sarawak column 1959 IV.

10. QUANTITY OF EXPORTS OF MAJOR COMMODITIES

Monthly averages or calendar months — *Thousand tons*

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
RICE													
Burma	141.5	162.1	155.7	127.7	150.4	*152.2*	154.4	209.9	209.4	130.6	58.9	*59.4*	*93.2*
Cambodia	8.4	5.8	19.2	21.2	20.2	30.7	20.9	30.3	23.4	42.6	26.4	*10.2*	*18.6*
China (Taiwan)	14.2	9.1	10.1	14.9	13.3	2.9	17.1	0.8	9.2	—	1.7	...	...
Thailand	102.6	105.1	130.8	88.8	91.5	100.7	100.6	100.7	106.9	111.0	84.0	175.0	*155.2*
Viet-Nam[a]	6.8	‖ 0.4	15.7	9.8	20.8	28.9	22.9	24.2	41.3	36.8	13.1	*11.1*	...
SUGAR													
China (Taiwan)	48.8	50.0	62.4	68.1	61.2	71.9	40.3	91.1	86.4	35.4	74.6	...	...
India	...	...	16.4	7.0	4.1	2.7	0.9	1.3	0.9	1.8	6.7	...	...
Indonesia	14.7	14.1	12.2	7.4	3.3	*3.0*	11.8	2.1	2.5	6.7	*0.3*	—	...
Philippines	77.2	74.4	59.1	80.8	77.8	86.7	67.4	84.1	128.4	50.6	83.7	126.5	122.9
TEA													
Ceylon	13.6	13.2	13.3	14.3	15.0	15.4	16.1	15.6	15.5	16.7	14.1	16.7	...
China (Taiwan)	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.0	2.2	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	...	...
India	13.6	19.5	16.5	18.9	17.7	16.1	26.6	13.0	7.0	17.7	26.7	20.4	12.2
Indonesia	2.4	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.5	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.0	*1.5*	...
Japan	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.7	*0.3*	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.7	1.2	0.9	...
Pakistan	0.4	0.8	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.2	1.2	0.5	—	—	0.1	—	...
HIDES & SKINS													
India (*tons*)	1,174	1,048	1,083	1,003	1,087	1,017	1,093	1,079	918	823	1,248	...	...
Pakistan[b] (*thousand pieces*)	749	878	856	887	979	*577*	1,152	939	1,226	*111*	*39*	...	...
COPRA[c] & COCONUT OIL													
Ceylon	11.8	10.3	6.4	5.2	8.2	6.3	8.5	4.3	5.2	7.7	7.1	...	...
Federation of Malaya[d,e] (coconut oil)	4.8	6.0	4.7	3.4	1.8	1.6	2.1	1.3	1.4	1.7	2.2	...	...
Indonesia (copra)	12.5	13.8	15.4	6.2	7.0	9.0	14.0	9.8	5.7	6.4	14.3	2.6	...
N. Borneo	1.9	3.2	3.4	3.7	3.2	4.3	3.6	3.3	4.8	5.0	4.1	...	...
Philippines	48.4	59.8	57.6	50.0	41.1	47.9	54.6	40.0	49.4	61.1	40.9	*14.7*	*14.8*
Singapore (coconut oil)[d]	2.9	2.7	3.7	2.3	1.4	1.6	2.1	1.4	2.0	1.1	1.7	...	...
PALM OIL													
Federation of Malaya[d,e]	2.2	2.2	2.9	3.8	3.9	4.8	3.5	5.1	2.6	6.4	5.1	..	...
Indonesia	10.5	10.4	10.8	11.0	8.6	9.1	11.4	7.0	8.6	10.6	10.1	6.3	...
Singapore[d]	2.3	2.4	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.8	1.8	2.5	2.8	3.1	3.0	...	...
GROUND NUTS[c] & OIL													
India	14.8	2.8	0.4	0.6	4.7	2.0	8.9	2.5	2.1	1.0	2.4	...	...
NATURAL RUBBER													
Brunei	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Burma	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.9	1.0	*1.0*	*0.8*	*1.0*	*1.0*	*1.0*	*1.0*	*1.0*	1.0
Cambodia	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.5	2.9	1.9	3.3	3.7	4.6	2.5
Ceylon	8.2	7.3	8.0	7.7	7.8	8.9	7.6	13.3	6.9	5.8	9.6	8.0	9.8
Federation of Malaya[d,e]	37.9	36.6	38.9	39.0	43.3	41.1	43.3	41.8	37.3	39.5	45.7	41.2	42.6
Indonesia	61.1	56.6	56.4	50.5	60.0	48.9	69.3	48.4	50.4	43.6	53.0	33.9	...
N. Borneo	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.9	2.2	1.9	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.4	1.8
Sarawak	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.3	5.3	4.4	3.0	2.3	3.6
Singapore[d,f]	15.6	15.7	16.1	17.2	19.3	14.2	19.5	11.2	16.6	15.6	13.2	15.6	16.9
Thailand	11.0	11.3	11.3	11.6	14.4	14.2	13.9	16.1	12.3	12.9	15.2	10.7	17.0
Viet-Nam, Republic of	5.2	5.3	6.1	5.7	6.1	6.2	6.6	6.2	4.3	7.7	6.4	8.9	6.9
COTTON, RAW													
India	7.9	5.9	3.4	6.1	4.9	2.8	2.9	3.5	3.0	1.5	3.2	...	...
Iran[g]	3.7	3.2	3.3	3.6	3.4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan	14.0	10.9	9.6	8.1	4.5	7.4	2.2	8.5	12.5	6.4	2.0	0.7	10.4
COTTON YARN (*tons*)													
Fed. of Malaya and Singapore[e]	9	44	11	43	158	226	238	211	295	186	215	...	...
Hong Kong	1,228	1,183	1,262	1,166	1,118	1,265	941	1,029	1,293	1,332	1,404	...	...
Japan	991	1,032	1,217	936	917	3,262	906	2,296	2,886	2,790	5,074	2,244	...
COTTON PIECE GOODS (*million sq. metres*)													
Fed. of Malaya and Singapore[e]	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.2	3.2	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.1	2.7	2.7	...	...
Hong Kong	11.5	9.8	13.7	15.4	16.4	21.8	16.9	14.9	19.2	22.8	22.9	...	...
India (*million metres*)	56.9	56.7	67.1	47.4	64.6	55.1	92.5	59.3	52.8	52.8	55.4	...	...
Japan	79.3	87.9	102.3	86.8	88.0	99.2	101.2	84.2	83.4	100.3	129.1	71.2	...
JUTE													
Pakistan (raw)	81.8	71.5	65.4	75.5	67.4	63.0	96.8	79.8	60.6	41.4	70.3	67.8	51.2
India (bag and cloth)	79.6	67.9	‖ 65.9	‖ 67.2	73.2	68.6	80.9	57.3	71.2	76.7	69.4	...	...
HEMP, RAW													
Philippines	9.3	10.2	9.6	8.4	8.1	8.4	7.6	10.2	7.4	7.6	8.6	*6.2*	*6.7*
TIN CONCENTRATES (*tons*)													
Burma	79	71	*72*	*112*	*117*	*118*	*152*	*118*	*88*	*135*	*131*	*86*	*80*
Federation of Malaya[h]	...	...	5,049	2,796	3,118	4,866	3,862	4,487	4,922	4,805	5,249	4,542	4,102
Indonesia	2,689	2,638	2,318	1,553	1,560	2,106	1,917	2,267	2,002	2,325	1,828	1,204	...
Thailand	935	1,052	1,130	548	854	1,072	1,018	1,128	1,006	1,103	1,049	788	950
TIN METAL (*tons*)													
Federation of Malaya[d,e]	3,204	4,399	4,252	3,212	3,727	6,396	4,456	5,645	5,284	7,275	7,382	...	...
Singapore[d]	2,821	1,806	1,763	667	49	65	16	59	34	98	107	...	...
PETROLEUM & PRODUCTS													
Brunei (crude oil only)	433	469	455	421	448	381	437	403	381	372	370	...	...
Fed. of Malaya and Singapore[e]	268	239	206	172	183	195	195	178	190	180	233	...	...
Indonesia	808	877	1,301	1,122	881	1,161	411	1,246	1,099	776	1,178	*185*	...

a. Beginning June 1955, Republic of Viet-Nam only.
b. From June 1960, data have been shown partly in pieces and partly in hundred-weight; the latter converted into tons are 709 for 3rd and 754 for 4th quarters.
c. In terms of oil equivalent.
d. Net exports.
e. Excluding trade between Singapore and Federation of Malaya.
f. Excluding Federation of Malaya rubber transhipped at Singapore.
g. Annual data: 12 months ending 21 July of year stated.
h. Deliveries from mines in the Federation of Malaya to smelters in Singapore, Penang and Butterworth.

EXTERNAL TRADE

11. INDEX NUMBERS OF QUANTUM, UNIT VALUE AND TERMS OF TRADE

1953=100[a]

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
								IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
A. Quantum														
BURMA														
Imports	122	104	88	132	82	127	...	137	...	...	...	...	...	...
Exports	132	146	165	153	118	153	...	151	213	204	...	...	...	...
CEYLON														
Imports: General . .	99	97	106	112	113	125	118	132	118	107	142	110	129	78
Exports: General . .	103	109	104	99	107	105	110	111	113	104	116	103	117	97
Imports (*Central Bank index*)	93	96	105	111	112	126	120	132	123	108	140	107	...	...
Consumer goods . . .	89	95	106	107	115	122	117	130	123	101	142	100	...	...
Capital goods . . .	103	104	102	125	102	139	133	140	128	134	134	134	...	...
Exports (*Central Bank index*)	103	109	102	100	106	104	109	110	120	103	111	106	...	...
CHINA (Taiwan)														
Imports (*ordinary and ICA*)	105	98	94	102	133	125	139	116	106	162	138	149	...	...
Exports	69	86	83	97	118	111	109	102	121	130	72	113	...	...
FEDERATION OF MALAYA and SINGAPORE														
Imports	107	128	140	139	139	139	*146*	148	145	138	*140*	*159*	...	...
Exports	110	118	127	130	130	130	*131*	137	128	124	*134*	*138*	...	...
INDIA														
Imports	118‡	125‡	‖147	168	151	159	161	154	148	176	166	154	...	...
Exports	105‡	115‡	‖110	119	108	119	109	144	106	101	106	124	...	...
JAPAN														
Imports: General . . .	104	109	138	172	142	179	225	193	218	218	230	234	248	266
Exports: General . . .	133	174	208	232	240	285	324	334	286	308	332	373	259	302
PHILIPPINES														
Imports[b]	111	125	115	137	121	106	115	122	108	121	112	121	131	103
Exports	111	121	135	127	140	139	147	140	135	177	142	136	123	126
THAILAND														
Imports	103	110	113	121	118	128	133	141	140	130	131	131	...	...
Exports	96	113	119	131	103	121	134	136	139	123	121	153	...	...
VIET-NAM[c]														
Imports	113	‖90	77	95	82	85	87	99	86	84	80	99	99	...
Exports	113	‖132	85	155	122	164	187	221	146	201	262	171	223	...
B. Unit Value														
BURMA														
Imports	93	89	82	91	98	85	...	85	...	...	...	...	...	...
Exports	77	62	62	60	62	57	...	54	55	57	...	...	...	...
CEYLON														
Imports: General . .	88	89	99	92	83	91	89	86	88	94	87	88	84	96
Exports: General . .	112	117	109	104	102	107	106	112	111	110	103	105	99	100
Imports (*Central Bank index*)	92	86	90	95	87	86	86	87	88	87	88	87	...	...
Consumer goods . . .	91	84	85	89	81	83	82	87	84	83	84	83	...	...
Capital goods . . .	95	97	107	114	105	98	100	99	101	101	100	101	...	...
Exports (*Central Bank index*)	111	116	109	104	102	107	107	112	112	111	103	105	...	...
CHINA (Taiwan)														
Imports (*ordinary and ICA*)	108	111	106	110	106	99	100	95	106	97	106	94	...	...
Exports	105	110	105	116	100	90	85	93	82	88	86	87	...	...
FEDERATION OF MALAYA and SINGAPORE														
Imports	90	92	91	96	91	93	*99*	97	102	103	*99*	*93*	...	...
Exports	94	120	110	105	95	115	*126*	126	135	135	*124*	*110*	...	...
INDIA														
Imports	97‡	95‡	‖99	107	100	98	98	95	98	99	97	97	...	...
Exports	107‡	98‡	‖102	102	101	99	111	101	108	109	112	112	...	...
INDONESIA														
Imports	91	91	89	88	96	83	...	89	94	99	...	...	...	...
Exports	96	110	103	99	89	88	...	120	101	105	...	...	...	...
JAPAN														
Imports	96	94	97	103	89	83	83	82	86	85	82	80	81	81
Exports	96	91	94	97	94	95	98	97	97	98	99	98	95	98
KOREA,[d] Republic of (1957=100)														
Imports	...	...	...	100	92	86	84	85	85	85	83	82	80	82
Exports	...	...	...	100	82	90	104	96	104	103	105	106	108	109
PAKISTAN[e]														
Imports	98	105	112	124	134	129	...	130	132	135	144	...	...	...
Exports	107	104	98	105	97	90	133	91	90	101	114	137	...	...
PHILIPPINES														
Imports[b]	96	96	97	100	102	104	107	105	105	106	106	109	108	110
Exports	89	81	83	84	87	94	93	97	99	95	90	88	86	88
THAILAND														
Imports	105	106	106	109	105	104	106	105	105	105	107	107	...	...
Exports	111	109	100	99	102	108	111	107	112	112	114	108	...	...
VIET-NAM[c]														
Imports	101	95	90	99	93	86	89	88	89	91	90	86	93	...
Exports	94	99	92	97	85	85	81	91	87	82	80	77	67	...

11. INDEX NUMBERS OF QUANTUM, UNIT VALUE AND TERMS OF TRADE *(Cont'd)*

1953=100[a]

C. Terms of trade

Percentage of unit value index of exports to unit value index of imports

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
								IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
BURMA	83	70	76	66	63	67	...	64	...	...	...	...	...	...
CEYLON	127	132	110	109	123	118	119	130	126	117	119	119	118	104
Ceylon (*Central Bank index*)	121	134	121	110	117	123	123	129	127	127	117	121	...	...
CHINA (Taiwan)	97	99	99	105	94	90	85	98	77	91	81	93	...	...
FEDERATION OF MALAYA and SINGAPORE	‖104	130	121	109	104	124	*127*	130	133	*132*	*126*	*118*	...	...
INDIA	110‡	103‡	‖103	95	101	101	113	107	111	111	115	116	...	...
INDONESIA	106	120	116	112	93	106	...	136	*108*	106	...	...	...	...
JAPAN	100	96	97	94	106	114	119	118	113	115	122	123	117	121
KOREA, Republic of	...	...	...	100	90	105	125	114	122	121	126	130	134	133
PAKISTAN	109	99	88	85	72	70	...	70	68	75	79	...	...	...
PHILIPPINES	93	85	85	84	85	90	...	92	94	90	84	81	79	80
THAILAND	106	103	95	91	97	104	105	102	106	107	107	101	...	...
VIET-NAM	93	‖104	102	98	91	99	92	104	97	91	89	90	72	...

a. Original base: *Burma*, 1952; *China; Taiwan*, 1952; *Ceylon*, 1948; *Federation of Malaya and Singapore*, 1952; *India*, Apr 1952/Mar 1953 prior to 1960, 1958 since 1960; *Indonesia*, 1950; *Japan*, 1950; *Republic of Korea*, 1957; *Pakistan*, Apr 1948/Mar 1949; *Philippines*, 1955; *Thailand*, 1953; *Viet-Nam*, 1949.

b. Based on f.o.b. import prices.
c. See footnote g to table 17.
d. Index in terms of U.S. dollars.
e. Imports excluding land trade. Index in terms of U.S. dollars.

12. INDEX NUMBERS OF PRICES RECEIVED AND PAID BY FARMERS

1953=100[a]

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
CHINA (Taiwan)													
Prices received by farmers (R)	102	110	122	122	136	189	150	167	190	199	201	...	...
Prices paid by farmers (P)	101	111	118	120	132	179	141	159	182	190	185	...	...
Cultivation cost	106	113	120	125	136	179	146	166	179	192	179	...	...
Domestic expenditure	100	109	117	117	130	179	139	156	183	189	187	...	...
Ratio (R) ÷ (P)	100	99	103	102	103	106	106	105	103	105	109	...	...
INDIA (Punjab)													
Prices received by farmers (R)	78	97	104	107	115	...	107	114	106	107	...	...	...
Prices paid by farmers (P)	86	96	104	108	117	...	114	119	113	117	...	...	...
Cultivation cost	79	91	95	105	116	...	110	117	110	110	...	...	...
Domestic expenditure	91	99	110	111	118	...	117	121	116	113	...	...	...
Ratio (R) ÷ (P)	90	101	100	99	98	...	93	96	94	96	...	...	...
INDIA (West Bengal, *1954=100*)													
Prices received by farmers (R)	102	118	135	143	141	...	148	145	150	...	...	...	...
Prices pcid by farmers (P)	98	106	113	119	120	...	124	122	124	...	...	...	...
Cultivation cost	98	103	105	111	116	...	118	113	116	...	...	...	...
Domestic expenditure	97	108	118	124	122	...	128	127	128	...	...	...	...
Ratio (R) ÷ (P)	105	111	119	120	117	...	119	119	122	...	...	...	...
JAPAN[b] (*Apr 1953-Mar 1954=100*)													
Prices received by farmers (R)	95‡	98	99	97	97	96	98	93	95	98	97	98	99
Prices paid by farmers (P)	101‡	102	105	103	103	105	104	105	105	106	107	108	108
Cultivation cost	98‡	98	102	100	97	100	97	98	99	100	101	102	103
Domestic expenditure	103‡	103	106	105	107	109	108	108	108	109	110	111	111
Ratio (R) ÷ (P)	94‡	97	94	94	94	91	94	89	91	93	91	91	92

a. Original base: *China (Taiwan)* 1952; *India, Punjab*, Sep 1938/Aug 1939; *West Bengal*, 1939; *Japan*, Apr 1951/Mar 1952.

b. Index numbers of commodity prices in 473 towns or villages.

13. INDEX NUMBERS OF WHOLESALE PRICES

1953=100[a]

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
BURMA													
All agricultural produce	96	99	114	112	103	113	111	106	110	118	120	119	...
Cereals	107	103	103	102	110	114	124	107	111	122	115	113	...
Non-food agricultural produce	107	103	124	137	121	115	115	121	118	110	110	119	...
CHINA (Taipei)													
General index	117	132	141	143	158	180	166	172	179	182	187	185	186
Food	114	123	135	142	165	199	177	186	195	203	212	206	210
Apparel	110	106	105	107	118	120	120	121	121	119	118	118	118
Metals and electrical materials[b]	158	190	197	189	186	199	188	190	206	202	198	199	198
Building materials	115	153	163	148	166	185	171	198	212	170	163	192	171
Manufactured products	120	143	162	158	167	180	174	178	184	180	180	182	181
Industrial materials	116	138	163	163	191	197	195	198	201	196	193	192	192
INDIA													
General index	88	99	104	107	110	118	114	114	117	120	121	121	122
Food articles	80	93	100	105	111	113	114	110	112	116	112	109	109
Industrial raw materials	91	105	110	107	112	129	116	122	129	128	138	144	149
Manufactured articles	101	106	109	110	111	123	114	118	121	122	127	129	131
Intermediate products	99	112	110	111	113	129	118	123	127	133	134	136	136
Finished products	101	106	109	110	111	122	113	117	120	122	126	128	130
INDONESIA (Djakarta) (imported goods)													
All articles	145	135	160	247	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Provisions	144	146	178	244	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Textile goods	169	118	137	248	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Chemicals	151	137	141	208	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Metals	115	135	169	234	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
IRAN (Teheran)													
General index	115	123	123	119	123	135	128	129	134	138	140	...	...
Domestic products	117	124	131	133	146	155	155	153	156	156	154	...	...
Imported products	105	96	88	82	85	93	87	92	93	92	104	...	...
Exported products[c]	116	136	134	125	121	138	123	123	135	144	151	...	...
JAPAN													
General index	98	102	105	98	99	101	101	101	100	101	102	103	103
Edible farm products	112	109	112	117	116	117	116	117	120	119	115	118	117
Textiles	87	88	82	75	77	77	80	78	76	76	77	78	77
Chemicals	90	94	95	88	85	87	86	86	87	86	86	86	85
Metal and machinery	97	116	119	103	105	104	106	106	105	104	103	102	102
Building materials	96	104	115	107	110	115	113	112	111	113	122	125	127
Producer goods	95	103	107	98	98	99	100	99	99	99	101	101	102
Consumer goods	101	100	102	99	100	103	102	103	103	104	103	104	104
KOREA, Republic of *(1955=100)*													
General index	100	132	153	143	147	163	153	156	163	169	164	179	190
Foods	100	141	168	145	138	159	136	142	161	174	159	180	190
Metal products and machinery	100	130	162	159	176	194	187	192	200	193	191	192	202
Building materials	100	121	135	144	165	193	191	188	196	195	192	191	208
Fibre and fibre products	100	122	127	126	128	137	140	138	131	136	144	149	164
Producer goods	100	138	156	156	174	193	190	192	194	193	193	207	224
Consumer goods	100	129	152	138	136	151	138	141	151	160	152	168	177
PHILIPPINES (Manila)													
General index	92	95	99	103	104	108	106	107	106	109	112	112	113
Food	95	96	102	105	98	104	100	99	101	103	114	113	113
Crude materials	84	90	92	99	117	116	119	122	115	113	113	115	116
Chemicals	88	88	93	96	100	97	100	100	99	95	95	96	98
Manufactured goods	92	100	103	104	110	113	114	115	112	113	112	113	115
Domestic products	92	94	98	101	101	105	103	104	103	106	109	109	110
Exported products	81	84	88	98	111	108	110	113	106	105	106	109	111
Imported products	92	100	106	110	120	127	125	125	126	126	128	130	132
THAILAND (Bangkok)													
General index	114	117	118	123	115	114	113	115	109	114	115	118	117
Agricultural produce[d]	136	130	130	143	134	132	135	133	128	133	132	135	125
Foodstuffs[d]	108	116	115	122	111	106	105	110	99	107	109	112	114
Clothes	102	101	101	101	101	101	100	100	101	102	102	102	102
Metal	126	139	141	108	116	121	123	123	123	122	118	114	114
Construction materials	104	103	105	103	103	103	104	104	104	103	102	102	102
VIET-NAM (Saigon-Cholon)													
General index	117	122	123	124	113	125	117	113	121	129	136	133	...
Rice and paddy	99	113	106	119	76	99	87	77	87	109	124	117	...
Raw materials	145	131	139	126	138	156	152	159	169	154	143	138	...
Semi-finished products	123	131	138	129	126	126	128	123	121	126	133	130	...
Manufactured products	124	121	111	117	111	124	115	118	121	123	134	136	...
Local products	116	123	121	123	106	119	110	106	116	125	131	126	...
Imported products	121	124	130	131	129	137	130	131	132	139	148	149	...

a. Original base: *Burma*, 1938-40; *China: Taiwan*, Jan-June 1937 prior to 1959. 1956 since 1959 except indexes of manufactured products and industrial materials for which the base is 1951; *India*, Apr 1952/Mar 1953; *Indonesia*, 1938; *Japan*, 1952; *Republic of Korea*, and *Philippines*, 1955; *Thailand*, Apr 1938/Mar 1939; *Viet-Nam*, 1949.

b. Beginning 1959, metals and manufactures thereof.

c. Excluding petroleum.

d. Agricultural produce including paddy, rice meal, copra, rubber, etc.; foodstuffs including milled rice, pork, bananas, etc.

14. PRICE QUOTATIONS OF MAJOR EXPORT COMMODITIES

	Unit	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
RICE														
Burma	£ per L. ton	41.1	35.6	34.2	37.0	32.9	32.3	32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	33.0	33.0	33.0
Cambodia	Ri per 100 kg.	379	...	335	382	356	...	363	360	345	416	...	...	...
China: Taiwan	NT$ per m.ton	2,634	3,776	3,644	3,643	5,309	5,244	5,311	5,312	5,239	—	5,239	...	...
Thailand	£ per L. ton	50.5	48.9	49.8	53.1	47.7	44.8	45.7	43.8	41.9	47.5	46.2	45.3	46.0
SUGAR														
China (Taiwan)	US$ per ton	104.6	104.3	139.3	98.4	84.4	86.9	85.8	81.3	83.4	91.9	91.2	85.6	...
India	Rs. per maund	28.1	27.9	30.8	32.5	36.0	37.5	37.0	37.5	37.5	37.5	37.5	37.5	37.5
Indonesia	Rp. per 100kg.	306	302	350	418	440	465	440	440	440	440	540	...	...
Philippines	Peso per picul	13.8	14.0	14.8	15.3	14.9	16.7	15.0	14.5	15.9	17.5	18.6	19.5	19.8
TEA														
Ceylon	Rs. per lb.	2.20	2.19	1.87	1.72	1.95	...	2.19	2.05	1.82	2.05	...	...	...
China: Taiwan	NT$ per kg.	11.49	11.96	10.08	12.67	16.20	18.31	15.04	17.88	16.55	19.21	18.67	...	...
India[r]	Rs. per kg.	6.73	5.69	5.79	5.55	5.37	5.82	...	5.15	5.57	6.56	5.81	5.55	5.45
Indonesia	Rp. per 100kg.	1,459	*1,072*	*1,097*	*1,116*	*1,039*	*4,331*	*881*	*4,417*	*4,240*	*4,223*	*4,455*	...	...
PEPPER														
Cambodia	Ri. per 63.42 kg.	3,507	4,350	4,771	3,465	2,827	...	3,092	3,875	4,200	5,200	...	...	...
India	Rs. per maund	131.6	110.9	77.7	71.7	100.2	216.8	119.2	205.2	235.8	241.1	185.1	163.8	166.2
Indonesia	Rp. per 100kg.	745	*551*	*469*	*457*	*492*	...	*615*	*2,674*	*3,992*	*4,438*	...	...	...
Sarawak	M$ per picul	109.6	70.2	69.5	66.9	82.6	170.0	88.5[c]	190.4	182.4	181.8	148.6	...	...
Singapore	M$ per picul	135.6	94.7	72.8	69.8	92.7	188.0	138.3	230.2	192.8	182.5	146.4	148.0	138.0
HIDES														
Pakistan	Rs. per 28 lbs.[a]	31.72	29.49	29.08	29.24	104.36	118.62	120.00	125.56	120.00	113.33	115.58	115.00	118.75
SKINS														
India	Rs. per 100 pcs.	287.6	300.4	353.1	336.9	392.9	344.3	433.3	441.7	379.2	306.2	250.0	275.0	293.8
Pakistan	Rs. per 100 pcs.	211.9	254.6	287.4	252.5	301.5	352.4	331.2	380.6	429.2	330.0	269.7	231.7	213.8
GROUNDNUTS														
India	Rs. per maund	15.94	24.42	25.34	25.15	28.58	33.26	28.78	30.64	32.49	35.09	34.82	34.86	36.03
COPRA														
Ceylon	Rs. per candy	209.5	212.2	239.8	264.8	302.6	276.2	213.7	323.0	295.4	264.2	240.8	...	...
Federation of Malaya	M$ per picul	26.38	25.70	26.85	35.13	41.29	33.17	41.00	40.33	33.33	31.00	28.00	27.25	27.75
Indonesia	Rp. per 100kg.	193	178	*156*	*179*	*237*	*759*	*240*	*777*	*807*	*763*	*691*	...	...
Philippines	peso per 100kg.	27.12	26.02	28.43	37.70	46.66	39.63	45.20	46.70	38.23	36.79	35.81	37.38	38.38
Singapore	M$ per picul	28.14	27.45	27.34	33.89	40.89	33.10	40.27	40.67	33.72	30.38	27.63	26.50	26.88
RUBBER, NATURAL														
Ceylon	Rs. per lb.	1.51	1.51	1.46	1.30	1.42	1.50	1.45	1.49	1.65	1.42	1.46	1.36	1.38
Indonesia	Rp. per 100kg.	888	*821*	*746*	*641*	*804*	*3,465*	*905*	*3,731*	*3,877*	*3,446*	*2,806*	...	...
Singapore	M Cents per lb.	114.16	96.76	88.75	80.25	101.56	108.08	116.36	116.09	124.25	103.46	89.46	83.18	79.86
Thailand	Baht per kg.	13.59	11.25	10.87	10.33	13.92	16.23[b]	15.92	17.34	17.74	16.18	13.84	...	...
United Kingdom	Pence per lb.	32.9	28.1	25.9	23.4	29.4	31.4	33.6	33.6	36.0	29.9	26.2	24.5	23.6
TIMBER														
Burma	K. per cu.ton	921	923	889	874	861	...	899	924	1,095	...	...	...	...
Federation of Malaya	M$ per 50 cu.ft.	156.6	158.2	144.6	143.3	127.9	155.6	139.5	152.8	155.9	161.7	150.3	152.8	145.8
North Borneo	M$ per 50 cu.ft.	77.9	77.5	66.1	64.7	74.6	87.7	90.9	90.9	96.8	89.3	79.1	...	...
Philippines	Peso per 1,000 bd.ft.	114	112	105	102	106	121	114	124	124	120	114	116	110
Thailand	Baht per cu. m.	3,614	4,098	4,090	3,867	3,956	4,368[b]	4,001	3,964	4,107	4,662	4,576	...	...
WOOL, RAW														
Pakistan	Rs. per lb.	2.15	2.70	2.77	2.06	2.33	2.50	2.30	2.46	2.51	2.67	2.36	2.80	2.40
COTTON, RAW														
Burma	K. per lb.	1.33	1.00	1.13	1.01	0.86	...	0.90	0.90	1.19	...	...	...	...
India	Rs. per 784 lbs.	635.8	786.7	766.7	732.0	767.6	840.7	—	840.0	840.0	840.0	846.4	846.4	841.3
Pakistan	Rs. per maund	79.6	88.8	87.0	81.9	74.2	91.1	82.5	89.9	90.0	94.2	90.4	98.1	94.3
JUTE, RAW														
India	Rs. per 400 lbs.	172	173	207	192	190	249	198	199	248	230	318	339	378
Pakistan	Rs. per 400 lbs.	150	187	214	188	190	...	198	217	272	258	...	...	...
United Kingdom	£ per L. ton	98	103	114	110	111	141	111	115	133	125	190	200	207
HEMP, RAW														
Philippines	Peso per picul	31.0	37.4	46.8	39.2	57.6	61.6	60.8	66.9	63.0	59.5	57.1	62.6	63.6
GROUND NUT OIL														
India	Rs. per quarter	11.92	17.82	19.11	18.79	20.50	23.50	20.23	22.08	23.23	24.23	24.47	25.45	26.02
PALM OIL														
Indonesia	Rp. per 100kg.	220	*233*	*232*	*212*	*217*	...	*217*	*861*	*809*	*828*	...	...	...
COCONUT OIL														
Ceylon	Rs. per L. ton	1,156	1,168	1,256	1,396	1,688	1,437	1,736	1,756	1,608	1,349	1,252	1,214	1,192
Philippines	Peso per kg.	0.48	0.45	0.47	0.66	0.80	0.70	0.77	0.80	0.71	0.65	0.63	0.66	0.69
Singapore	M$ per picul	44	44	46	54	65	53	64	64	54	48	44	44	45
RAYON YARN														
Japan	Yen per lb.	173	172	171	151	148	147	152	147	147	147	147	147	147
COTTON PIECE GOODS														
India	Rs. per lb.	1.80	1.94	2.04	1.81	1.84	2.71	1.90	‖2.59	2.59	3.08	—	‖0.61	0.60
Japan	Yen per yd.	50	54	48	42	53	55	59	60	54	54	52	51	51
JUTE MANUFACTURES														
India (bag)	Rs. per 100 bags	115.6	111.2	114.6	98.6	98.1	138.9	105.0	113.2	131.0	137.3	174.1	190.9	207.9
India (hessian)	Rs. per 100 yd.	45.0	43.0	44.3	43.0	42.4	50.6	42.8	43.9	50.8	48.9	58.7	64.3	69.5
TIN														
Indonesia	Rp. per m.ton	14,986	*16,078*	*16,011*	*15,649*	*15,757*	...	*16,063*	*65,325*	*69,773*	*65,434*	...	...	...
Singapore	M$ per picul	365.5	387.0	373.2	369.3	396.9	393.8	383.1	389.9	388.6	401.4	394.8	390.3	395.2
Thailand	Baht per kg.	28.2	28.8	28.9	28.0	31.6	31.8[b]	30.9	32.1	31.7	30.9	31.9	...	...

14. PRICE QUOTATIONS OF MAJOR EXPORT COMMODITIES *(Cont'd)*

	Unit	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
PETROLEUM, CRUDE														
Indonesia	*Rp. per m.ton*	160	*163*	*163*	*181*	*181*	...	*196*	*510*	*518*	*543*	...	...	...
Iran	*US$ per barrel*	1.67	1.67	1.75	1.80	1.64	1.60	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.60	1.58	1.58	1.58
Sarawak	*M$ per m.ton*	63	61	64	65	60	58	59[c]	59	59	59	56	...	...
PETROLEUM PRODUCTS														
Indonesia	*Rp. per litre*	0.30	*0.31*	*0.30*	*0.32*	*0.31*	...	*0.33*	*0.98*	*0.98*	*0.93*	...	...	...

SPECIFICATIONS:

RICE: *Burma* — Average of export contract prices f.o.b. white rice, No. 1 small mills special ngasein. *Cambodia*—Wholesale prices of white rice No. 1—25% broken, at Phnom—Penh. *China: Taiwan*—Unit value of export of rice and paddy. *Thailand*—Export price f.o.b. Bangkok, white rice 5% broken.

SUGAR: *China: Taiwan* — Monthly average price of all kinds of sugagr f.o.b. Taiwan ports. *India* — Wholesale prices, D. 28 Kanpur. *Indonesia* — Domestic wholesale prices of white sugar, Djakarta. *Philippines* — Wholesale prices of centrifugal sugar, Manila.

TEA: *Ceylon*—Average weekly auction prices of weighted average for three grades of black tea in Colombo. *China: Taiwan* — Unit value of export of black tea. *India*—Export price at Calcutta auctions, leaf, all types. *Indonesia* —Export prices f.o.b. for B.O.P., O.P., P.S. and B.P.

PEPPER: *Cambodia* — Wholesale prices, black ex-store. *India* — Wholesale prices, ungarbled (alleppey) Calcutta. *Indonesia* — Export prices, f.o.b. black Lampong. *Sarawak* — Unit value of exports of black pepper. *Singapore* — Average wholesale prices, black Lampong.

HIDES: *Pakistan* — Average wholesale prices of Karachi unframed arsinicated mixed 12/40 lbs. (buffalo), Karachi, since August 1959 10/40 lbs.

SKINS: *India* — Wholesale prices of raw goat skin, average quality, Calcutta. *Pakistan* — Average wholesale prices of sheep skin, Papra (dewooled all primes), Karachi.

GROUNDNUTS: *India* — Wholesale prices of ground nuts, machine shelled, Cuddalore.

COPRA: *Ceylon* — f.o.b. prices for all grades. *Federation of Malaya* — Wholesale prices, sundried. *Indonesia* — Export prices f.o.b. mixed. *Philippines* — Wholesale prices, resecada, Manila. *Singapore* — Wholesale prices, sundried.

RUBBER, NATURAL: *Ceylon*—Unit value of exports of rubber sheet. *Indonesia* —Export prices f.o.b. R.S.S. 1 and Crepe 1. *Singapore*—Buyers' midday prices, f.o.b. Singapore No. 1 RSS in bales. Annual prices are the averages of daily prices. *Thailand* — Unit value of exports of rubber smoked sheet. Annual figures relate to whole kingdom, monthly and quarterly figures relate to Port of Bangkok only. *United Kingdom* — domestic/import price cif London, No. 1 RSS.

TIMBER: *Burma* — Unit value of teak exports. *Federation of Malaya* — Unit value of net exports of timber. *North Borneo*—Unit value of sawn logs and veneer logs, non-coniferous. *Philippines* — Unit value of exports of logs and lumber. *Thailand* — Unit value of exports of teak board. Annual figures relate to whole kingdom, monthly and quarterly figures relate to Port of Bangkok only.

WOOL, RAW: *Pakistan* — Unit value of exports.

COTTON, RAW: *Burma* — Unit value of exports. *India* — Wholesale prices, Jarilla M.G.F. at Bombay prior to August 1959; at Madhya Pradesh 25/32" for August 1959 to December 1959; at Madhya Pradesh 26/32" for subsequent period. *Pakistan* — Monthly average wholesale prices of 289 F. Punjab R.G. Karachi.

JUTE, RAW: *India* — Domestic price at Calcutta, raw lightnings. *Pakistan* — Domestic/export f.o.b. Chittagong, raw, baled, export firsts. *United Kingdom* — Domestic/import price c. and f. Dundee, Pakistan mill firsts.

HEMP, RAW: *Philippines* — Domestic/export price at Manila, Manila Hemp, Grade G.

GROUND-NUT OIL: *India* — Wholesale prices, naked, Bombay.

PALM OIL: *Indonesia* — Export prices f.o.b.

COCONUT OIL: *Ceylon* — f.o.b. prices for all grades. *Philippines* — Wholesale prices, Manila. *Singapore* — f.o.b. Singapore.

RAYON YARN: *Japan* — Export prices f.o.b. viscose, 120 denier hank, 1st grade

COTTON PIECE GOODS: *India* — Wholesale prices of grey standard shirting 35" × 38 yds. prior to 1960, dyeing grey standard shirting 35" × 38 yds. for 1960, since January 1961 — modern mills grey shirting 923 sheeting 34" × 40 yds. (on the basis of Rs.0.68 = index 163.5, which is equivalent to Rs.3.14 of the preceeding series) *Japan* — Export prices f.o.b., heavy shirting s/2003 grey 38".

JUTE MANUFACTURES: *India* — Export prices of bags, B-twills 2½ lbs. 44 × 26½" (22 × 26½" since April 1960) f.a.s. Calcutta. *India*—Domestic/export prices of hessian cloth 10½ oz. 40" Calcutta.

TIN: *Indonesia* — Unit value of exports of tin and tin ore. *Singapore* — Export prices ex-works. *Thailand* — Unit value of exports of tin ore and tin in concentrates. Annual figures relate to whole kingdom, monthly and quarterly figures relate to Port of Bangkok only.

PETROLEUM, CRUDE: *Indonesia* — Unit value of exports of crude petroleum. *Iran* — Export price, f.o.b. Abadan, 31-39.9° API gravity. *Sarawak* — Unit value of exports of crude petroleum.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTS: *Indonesia*—Unit value of exports of motor spirit.

a. Since 1959, Rs per 82 lbs. b. Port of Bangkok only.
c. Average July-December.

15. INDEX NUMBERS OF COST OF LIVING

1953 = 100[a]

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
A. All items													
BURMA: Rangoon	99	106	112	108	96	108	100	101	111	111	109	109	108
CAMBODIA: Phnom-Penh	121	127	127	135	141	...	147	148	147	153	...	...	...
CEYLON: Colombo	99	99	101	103	104	102	104	104	101	100	102	102	102
CHINA: Taipei	112	123	133	134‖	146	172	153	157	170	181	182	180	184
FED. OF MALAYA (*all races*)[b]	89	90	95	94	91	91	91	‖91	91	90	91	91	91
HONG KONG	95	97	98	96	104	100	100	102	100	99	98	100	...
INDIA[c] (*interim index*)	91	99	105	109	114	117	118	115	116	119	118	115	116
INDONESIA: Djakarta[d]	...	...	...	...	‖100	...	102	119	136	145	...	...	...
IRAN	122	130	139	138	152	164	155	159	163	164	168	173	176
JAPAN (*urban*)	105	106	109	108	110	114	111	112	113	115	115	117	117
KOREA: Seoul	‖231	284	350	339	353	382	363	368	388	391	382	405	415
LAOS: Vientiane	125	141	174	187	199	203	187	186	189	194	243	...	...
PAKISTAN[c] Karachi	94	97	106	110	106	114	112	114	114	114	113	114	114
Narayanganj	85	99	104	110	109	113	112	111	114	114	112	114	114
PHILIPPINES: Manila	98	100	102	105	104	109	107	105	106	111	113	110	109
SINGAPORE	91	92	94	92	92	...	92	92	92	91	...	...	...
THAILAND: Bangkok	105	111	118	125	119	118	114	116	114	121	121	122	123
VIET-NAM: Saigon	124	139	133	130	133	131	131	130	128	133	135	135	...
B. Food													
BURMA: Rangoon	97	104	115	110	95	113	101	102	115	118	115	114	113
CAMBODIA: Phnom-Penh	119	130	129	141	143	...	146	145	143	147	...	...	...
CEYLON: Colombo	99	97	99	100	99	96	100	99	95	92	95	94	94
CHINA: Taipei	108	126	137	138‖	154	190	163	169	188	202	201	197	201
FED. OF MALAYA (*all races*)[d]	...	...	...	...	‖100	100	100	101	99	99	100	100	101
HONG KONG	90	95	95	93	106	98	98	102	98	96	94	98	...
INDIA (*interim index*)	84	96	103	108	115	115	118	114	114	118	116	113	112
INDONESIA: Djakarta[d]	141	161	177	258	‖100	...	98	110	124	...	...	...	...
IRAN	114	121	126	120	135	147	137	143	146	147	151	158	163
JAPAN (*urban*)	105	105	108	106	107	111	108	108	110	114	112	114	115
KOREA: Seoul	‖206	282	339	310	308	353	314	326	363	375	348	384	399
LAOS: Vientiane	118	122	157	176	189	197	172	174	175	183	257	...	...
PAKISTAN: Karachi	95	100	113	117	113	122	119	122	121	122	122	123	123
Narayanganj	80	97	102	105	105	111	110	109	111	112	110	109	110
PHILIPPINES: Manila	98	101	105	111	107	114	111	106	109	115	122	115	114
SINGAPORE	88	89	91	87	86	...	88	87	85	84	...	...	...
THAILAND: Bangkok	103	108	117	126	116	116	110	113	111	121	120	121	122
VIET-NAM: Saigon	121	140	129	125	124	120	121	120	115	123	124	127	...

GENERAL NOTES: All figures refer to working class expenditures except for the following countries: *Burma*, low and middle income group of households; *China (Taiwan)*, public servants prior to 1959, beginning 1959, major city consumers' prices; *Hong Kong*, clerical and technical workers; *Indonesia*, government employees; *Japan*, urban population; *Republic of Korea*, salaried workers and wage earners; *Laos*, middle class; *Singapore*, low income clerks and labourers; *Thailand*, low salaried workers and civil servants.

a. Original base: *Burma*, 1958; *Cambodia*, 1949; *Ceylon*, 1952; *China: Taiwan*, Jan-Jun 1937 prior to 1959, 1956 since 1959; *Hong Kong*, Mar 1947; *India*, 1949; *Indonesia*, July 1938 prior to 1959, 1959 for subsequent years; *Japan*, 1955; *Republic of Korea*, 1955; *Laos*, Dec 1948; *Federation of Malaya*, Jan 1949 prior to 1960, 1959 since 1960; *Pakistan*, Apr 1948/Mar 1949; Philippines, 1955; *Singapore*, 1939; *Thailand* Apr 1938/Mar 1939; *Republic of Viet-Nam*, 1949.

b. Excluding house rent prior to 1960.

c. Excluding house rent.

d. Beginning 1959, base 1959 = 100.

16. EMPLOYMENT
End of period

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1 9 6 0				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
CHINA[a] (Taiwan, *thousand*)													
Mining	55	66	74	74	*74*	76	*74*	71	76	75	76	...	...
Manufacturing	258	260	261	261	*263*	269	*263*	266	270	272	269	...	...
Transport	66	68	71	73	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	...	...
FEDERATION OF MALAYA[b] (*thousand*)													
Estate[c]	309	309	307	314	311	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rubber	278	280	277	282	282	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tin mining	40	40	38	26	21	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Government	171	171	189	187	182	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
INDIA (*thousand*)													
Factories under Factory act[d]	2,690	3,402	3,480	3,413	3,641	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cotton mills[d]	758	807	813	767	763	772	772	767	759	783	781	783	686
Coal mines[e]	348	352	370	364	364	380	358	379	375	378	389	...	...
Central government[f]													
Office workers	251	281	300	313	328	...	328	330	331	...	...	...	...
Manual workers	396	388	389	401	415	...	415	419	423	...	...	...	...
JAPAN[g] (*million*)													
All industries	40.9	41.7	42.8	43.1	43.7	44.7	44.2	42.1	45.7	45.8	45.3	42.3	42.5
Agriculture, forestry and hunting	16.9	16.4	16.1	15.5	15.4	14.9	15.8	13.2	16.2	15.6	14.7	11.4	11.5
Mining	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4
Manufacturing	7.1	7.6	8.1	8.6	8.5	9.1	8.5	8.7	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.3
Construction	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.6
Commerce	6.7	7.0	7.3	7.5	7.6	8.0	7.7	7.9	7.9	8.0	8.2	8.2	8.3
Transportation, communication and other public utilities	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.4
Services (non-government)	4.3	4.6	4.9	5.0	5.2	5.5	5.3	5.1	5.2	5.7	5.9	5.9	5.9
PHILIPPINES													
Index of employment[h] (1953=100)													
Mining	81	81	77	72	68	68	67	68	68	67	68	...	...
Manufacturing	106	107	113	113	119	123	120	125	122	120	124	...	...
THAILAND[d] (*thousand*)													
Mining	15.6	16.6	17.4	14.9	14.1	15.1	14.1	14.3	15.0	15.3	16.0	15.8	15.7

a. Staff and permanent workers.
b. August for 1955, July for 1956 to 1959.
c. Comprising rubber, oil palm, coconut, tea and pineapple.
d. Daily averages.
e. Average daily employment in all coal mines governed by the Indian Mines Act. Monthly figures are slightly short of total coverage.
f. Regular Central Government establishments excluding railways. Office workers comprise administrative, executive and clerical staff; manual workers comprise skilled, semi-skilled workers.
g. Average for the week ending on the last day of the month, except for December when the week prior to holiday seasons was chosen.
h. Comprising all full and part-time employees who were on the payroll i.e., who worked during, or received pay for, the pay period ending nearest the 15th of the month. Excluding proprietors, self-employed persons, domestic servants and unpaid workers.

17. WAGES
Base for index numbers, 1953[a]

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1 9 6 0				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
CEYLON													
Index of wages													
Tea and rubber estate workers[b]	106	107	108	110	110	109	110	110	109	107	109	109	109
Government workers (Colombo)[c]	104	106	109	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125
CHINA (Taiwan)													
Index of earnings[d]													
Mining	131	174	227	243	246	271	254	262	270	267	285	...	...
Manufacturing	125	141	155	165	177	207	183	200	203	209	217	...	...
FED. OF MALAYA													
Earnings (*Malayan dollar*)													
Rubber tappers (*Monthly*)	75.4[e]	78.0[f]	81.0[f]	—	82.0[f]	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
INDIA													
Wages or earnings (*rupees*)													
Cotton mills[g] (Bombay, *monthly*)	94.8	98.8	104.2	111.6	116.4	119.2	120.4	119.2	118.8	119.7	119.4	126.8	...
Coal mines[h] (Jahria, *weekly*)	14.2	17.4	20.5	22.0	22.8	23.6	23.1	23.1	23.7	23.6	24.3	...	...
JAPAN													
Index of earnings[i]													
Mining	108	118	137	140	145	155	166	132	141	168	180	...	...
Manufacturing	109	120	124	127	138	150	171	120	141	152	187	...	...
Daily money wages of agricultural labour, male (*yen*)	301	308	323	337	348	372	361	328	384	382	392	366	366
KOREA, Republic of													
Wages[j] (*thousand hwan*)													
Mining	...	...	26.4	27.0	32.2	35.7	34.2	34.1	34.3	36.2	38.4	37.5	35.7
Manufacturing	...	...	20.3	21.7	23.5	26.0	23.5	24.2	24.8	26.8	28.2	28.8	27.2
PHILIPPINES													
Index of wages[k] (Manila)													
Skilled	101	101	101	104	106	106	107	106	106	106	105	105	105
Unskilled	102	103	102	103	104	104	103	103	104	104	104	104	105

a. Original base: *Ceylon*, 1939; *China (Taiwan)*, June 1949; *Japan*, 1955; *Philippines*, 1955.
b. Daily rates of minimum wages (basic wages plus special allowance).
c. Monthly wage rates for unskilled male workers in government employment.
d. Daily average of wages and allowances including payment in kind.
e. At August.
f. At July.
g. Monthly minimum basic wages plus dearness allowance.
h. Average weekly earnings (basic wages plus dearness allowance and other payments) of underground miners and loaders in coal mines.
i. Averge monthly cash earnings per regular worker.
j. Total monthly average earnings of production workers based on the payroll reports collected from representative sample establishments throughout the country engaged in mining and manufacturing (excluding tobacco and salt manufacturing).
k. Daily average wage rates of all classes of workers.

18. CURRENCY AND BANKING

End of period

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
BURMA (*million kyats*)													
Money supply	1,116	1,343	1,106	1,311	1,485	1,467	1,485	1,599	1,560	1,503	1,467	1,548	1,627
Currency: net active	725	830	746	853	1,021	1,004	1,021	1,156	1,089	1,010	1,004	1,094	1,167
Deposit money	391	513	360	458	464	463	464	443	471	493	463	454	460
Private time deposits (Commercial banks)	122	103	100	118	212	165	212	156	144	162	165	163	170
Government deposits	248	248	282	281	262	313	262	306	303	292	313	288	...
Union Bank of Burma	130	117	77	50	48	60	48	53	40	45	60	29	...
Commercial Bank[a]	118	131	205	231	214	253	214	253	263	247	253	259	...
Bank clearings Δ	246	293	317	270	289	338	302	329	386	347	288	289	...
Foreign assets	540	652	446	576	642	644	642	599	729	665	644	614	560
Union Bank of Burma	415	535	382	490	568	567	568	513	645	583	567	542	497
Commercial banks	124	117	64	86	74	77	74	86	84	82	77	72	63
Claims on private sector (commercial banks)	216	250	343	270	305	379	305	396	359	355	379	472	494
Claims on government	941	1,020	1,002	1,185	1,375	1,241	1,375	1,426	1,238	1,260	1,241	1,266	1,314
Union Bank of Burma[b]	652	662	762	710	797	729	797	908	723	709	729	799	892
Commercial banks	289	358	240	475	578	512	578	518	515	551	512	467	422
Rates of interest (*% per annum*)													
Call money rate Δ	1.27	0.94	1.42	1.60	1.08	1.52	1.33	1.50	1.50	1.35	1.75	2.75	2.75
Yield of long term gov't bonds[c] Δ	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Exchange rate (selling)	4.778	4.808	4.775	4.785	4.790	4.778	4.790	4.775	4.775	4.765	4.778	4.775	4.790
CAMBODIA (*million riels*)													
Money supply													
Currency: in circulation	999	1,058	1,355	1,472	1,799	2,017	1,799	2,100	1,985	2,103	2,017	2,087	2,215
Demand deposits in commercial banks	1,035	1,104	693	885	1,143	1,432	1,143	1,280	1,444	1,562	1,432	1,454	1,475
Private time deposits	37	15	84	76	159	274	159	229	254	277	274	248	252
Bank clearings Δ	446	412	481	520	570	725	626	684	686	738	794	886	669
Foreign assets	1,968	2,559	2,911	3,442	3,505	3,903	3,705	3,951	3,780	3,920	3,903	3,917	3,946
Banque Nationale du Cambodge	1,751	2,454	2,756	3,366	3,566	3,706	3,566	3,765	3,636	3,748	3,706	3,756	3,796
Commercial banks	217	105	155	76	139	197	139	185	144	168	197	161	150
Claims on private sector	329	563	812	776	1,147	1,719	1,147	1,264	1,421	1,648	1,719	1,699	1,781
Claims on government by Banque Nationale du Cambodge	1,014	1,014	1,014	1,014	1,114	1,014	1,014	1,014	1,014	1,014	1,014	1,014	1,014
CEYLON (*million rupees*)													
Money supply	1,062	1,118	1,032	1,067	1,169	1,197	1,169	1,186	1,161	1,172	1,197	1,194	1,184
Currency: net active	384	401	435	530	565	595	565	578	594	580	595	584	584
Deposit money	677	717	597	537	604	602	604	608	567	593	602	610	600
Private time deposits	450	510	558	617	688[r]	768	688[r]	686[r]	724[r]	744[r]	768	767	767
Government deposits	116	176	128	164	100	92	100	102	66	87	92	90	75
Central Bank of Ceylon	42	67	12	28	18	12	18	14	12	12	12	14	10
Commercial banks	74	109	116	136	81	81	81	88	53	75	81	75	65
Bank clearings Δ	758	735	730	661	714	743	744	726	731	761	754	784	714
Bank debits[d] Δ	1,060	1,063	1,111	970	1,050	1,094	1,022	1,116	1,084	1,122	1,052	1,089	954
Foreign assets (*net*)	857	878	669	580	389	215	387	393	322	267	215	205	202
Central Bank of Ceylon	655	736	579	492	315	133	315	302	250	169	133	119	109
Commercial banks	200	143	90	88	75	83	75	93	72	99	83	87	93
Claims on the private sector (commercial banks)	256	344	399	436	458	488	458	486	493	501	488	501	490
Claims on government	596	672	750	906	1,182[r]	1,451	1,182	1,170[r]	1,229[r]	1,328[r]	1,451	1,445	1,432
Central Bank of Ceylon	18	11	88	261	514	760	514	501	584	678	760	745	738
Other banks	578	661	665	645	668	691	668	669	645	650	691	700	694
Rates of interest (*% per annum*)													
Call money rate Δ	0.50	0.50	1.08	1.25	1.42	1.88	1.50	1.50	1.75	2.25	2.00	2.00	2.00
Treasury bill rate Δ	0.79	0.68	0.88	1.54	1.93	2.44	2.01	2.23	2.44	2.48	2.60	2.60	2.60
Yield of long term gov't bonds[e] Δ	3.13	3.04	2.99	2.91	2.76	2.90	2.70	2.65	2.61	2.87	3.47	3.46	3.42
Exchange rate (selling)	4.772	4.800	4.765	4.755	4.753	4.762	4.757	4.752	4.765	4.760	4.762	4.762	4.780
CHINA: Taiwan: (*million new Taiwan dollars*)													
Money supply	2,636	3,261	3,938	5,238	5,981	6,514	5,981	5,892	5,927	6,014	6,514	6,202	6,482
Currency: net active	1,604	1,883	2,228	2,927	3,277	3,426	3,277	3,060	3,127	3,113	3,426	3,247	3,402
Deposit money	1,032	1,378	1,710	2,310	2,704	3,088	2,704	2,832	2,800	2,901	3,088	2,955	3,080
Private time deposits	1,010	1,049	1,473	2,687	3,476	4,729	3,476	3,683	3,910	4,316	4,729	4,832	5,040
Government deposits	998	1,295	1,606	1,738	1,955	2,062	1,955	2,143	2,298	2,305	2,062	2,243	1,945
Bank of Taiwan	826	1,167	1,441	1,551	1,727	1,854	1,727	1,885	2,070	2,042	1,854	1,994	1,742
Other banks	172	128	164	188	228	208	228	257	226	263	208	249	203
Counterpart funds	1,405	1,485	1,651	1,553	1,835	2,624	1,835	1,587	1,809	2,122	2,624	2,743	2,896
Bank clearings Δ	2,887	3,857	5,121	5,410	6,892	8,695	7,889	7,993	8,797	8,794	9,194	8,816	8,065
Foreign assets (*net*)													
Bank of Taiwan	504	528	649	1,708	1,524	2,597	1,524	1,691	1,992	2,103	2,597	2,605	2,705
Claims on private sector[f]	1,960	2,198	3,043	4,122	5,684	6,694	5,684	6,021	6,337	6,473	6,694	6,746	6,808
Bank of Taiwan	402	470	731	1,023	1,091	1,135	1,091	1,016	1,201	1,128	1,135	1,124	1,143
Other banks	1,646	1,816	2,400	3,391	4,593	5,559	4,593	5,005	5,136	5,345	5,559	5,622	5,665
Claims on government[g]	1,687	2,020	2,361	2,374	2,604	3,178	2,604	2,690	2,721	2,924	3,178	3,275	3,366
Bank of Taiwan	1,652	1,974	2,311	2,286	3,293	2,895	2,293	2,382	2,394	2,613	2,895	2,976	3,039
Other banks	35	46	50	88	311	283	311	308	326	311	283	299	327
Claims on official entities[f]	2,046	2,563	2,905	3,350	3,707	4,359	3,707	3,599	3,579	3,866	4,359	4,363	4,384
Bank of Taiwan	1,948	2,473	2,827	3,248	3,608	3,939	3,608	3,433	3,426	3,661	3,939	3,987	4,005
Commercial banks	98	90	78	102	99	420	99	166	153	205	420	376	379

18. CURRENCY AND BANKING *(Cont'd)*

End of period

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
CHINA: Taiwan: *(million new Taiwan dollars) (Cont'd)*													
Exchange rate													
Buying:													
Sugar, Rice Exports	20.35	20.35	20.35	36.08									
Other Exports:													
Government	20.35	26.35	26.35	37.58	39.70	39.85	39.70	40.02	40.00	40.00	39.85	40.03	40.03
Private	26.35	26.35											
Non-Trade	21.95– 29.05	24.68 29.05	24.68 29.05	36.08 37.58									
Selling:													
Government Imports	24.78	24.78	24.78	36.38	36.38		36.38	36,38	36.38				
Other Imports	32.28	32.28	32.28	37.78		39.85				40.00	39.85	40.03	40.03
Non-Trade	24.78	24.78	24.78	36.38 37.78	39.70		39.70	40.02	40.00				
FEDERATION OF MALAYA and SINGAPORE *(million Malayan dollars)*													
Money supply	1,267	1,268	1,230	1,237	1,430	1,504	1,430	1,492	1,491	1,492	1,504	1,522	1,540
Currency: net active	861	892	889	895	1,016	1,071	1,016	1,034	1,042	1,058	1,071	1,084	1,105
Deposit money	406	376	341	345	414	433	414	458	449	434	433	437	435
Time deposits	338	320	305	355	462	559	462	483	510	545	559	561	560
Bank debits[h] Δ	1,438	1,600	1,679	1,628	1,762	1,956	1,862	1,939	1,865	2,030	1,983	1,761	1,803
Foreign assets	1,542	1,468	1,375	1,460	1,749	1,832	1,749	1,789	1,823	1,807	1,832	1,778	1,777
Currency Board	965	992	1,004	1,082	1,379	1,467	1,379	1,418	1,431	1,426	1,467	1,463	1,486
Other banks (net)	577	476	371	378	370	365	370	371	392	381	365	315	291
Claims on private sector	194	252	279	295	372	474	372	458	455	491	474	517	546
Claims on government	95	98	104	113	140	179	140	147	158	163	179	187	184
Exchange rate *(par rate)*	3.06	3.06	3.06	3.06	3.06	3.06	3.06	3.05	3.05	3.05	3.06	3.06	3.07
HONG KONG *(million HK dollars)*													
Money supply													
Currency notes: in circulation	727	732	755	772	838	931	838	885	900	902	931	931	973
Bank clearings Δ	1,160	1,276	1,412	1,309	1,480	1,925	1,788	1,903	1,856	1,870	2,071	2,162	2,082
INDIA *(thousand million rupees)*													
Money supply	20.47	21.79	22.76	23.50	25.21	27.37	25.21	27.03	27.02	26.31	27.37	27.93	28.16
Currency: net active	13.86	14.85	15.27	16.06	17.53	18.99	17.53	18.61	18.69	18.20	18.99	19.45	19.67
Deposit money	6.61	6.93	7.49	7.43	7.67	8.38	7.67	8.39	8.33	8.11	8.38	8.48	8.50
Private time deposits	6.13	6.98	8.93	11.40	13.98	14.30	13.98	14.31[r]	15.07	14.77	14.30	14.16	13.11
Government deposits (Reserve Bank of India)	0.70	0.73	0.72	0.79	0.90	0.85	0.90	1.09	0.87	0.86	0.85	0.80	0.84
Bank clearings Δ	6.52	7.03	7.41	7.96	8.99	10.11	9.39	9.85	10.06	9.74	10.80	11.00	10.22
Foreign assets (Reserve Bank of India)	7.75	6.48	4.15	3.07	3.31	2.70	3.31	3.15	2.75	2.57	2.70	2.66	2.77
Claims on private sector	7.04	8.84	10.16	10.39	11.64	13.84	11.64	13.10	13.42	13.45	13.84	14.41	14.78
Commercial banks	6.78	8.48	9.61	9.65	10.57	12.49	10.57	12.04	12.22	12.12	12.49	13.06	13.43
Cooperative banks	0.26	0.36	0.55	0.74	1.07	1.34	1.07	1.06	1.20	1.33	1.34	1.35	1.35
Claims on government	14.05	16.93	21.88	26.33	29.15	29.78	29.15	30.08	30.76	29.84	29.78	29.93	29.71
Reserve Bank of India	7.13	9.82	14.13	16.35	17.35	19.03	17.37	18.74	19.09	18.31	19.03	19.32	19.32
Other banks	5.74	5.96	6.63	8.84	10.58	9.41	10.58	10.04	10.33	10.24	9.41	9.24	9.00
Treasury currency	1.18	1.15	1.12	1.14	1.21	1.34	1.21	1.31	1.34	1.29	1.34	1.37	1.39
Rates of interest *(% per annum)*													
Call money rate Δ	2.59	3.21	3.71	2.96	2.74	3.71	2.25	3.56	3.61	3.51	4.16	5.18	5.26
Yield of long-term gov't bonds[i] Δ	3.72	3.92	4.13	4.17	4.05	4.06	4.04	4.06	4.09	4.06	4.05	4.03	4.05
Exchange rate (selling)	4.778	4.805	4.770	4.780	4.783	4.773	4.783	4.768	4.770	4.763	4.773	4.773	4.790
INDONESIA *(thousand million rupiah)*													
Money supply	12.23	13.39	18.91	29.37	34.89	47.84	34.89	39.06	42.64	43.34	47.84	47.71	...
Currency: net active	8.65	9.37	14.09	19.87	26.38	34.08	26.38	30.09	31.54	31.91	34.08	33.28	...
Deposit money	3.59	4.02	4.82	9.49	8.50	13.76	8.50	8.96	11.10	11.44	13.76	14.24	...
Private time deposits	0.33	0.29	0.29	0.34	0.18	0.33	0.18	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.33	...	...
Foreign assets (net)	2.77	1.68	1.26	2.48	14.75	18.40	14.75	18.23	18.36	17.51	18.40	...	...
Bank Indonesia	1.95	0.90	0.58	2.15	12.43	14.62	12.43	15.82	16.12	15.48	14.62	...	...
Gross foreign assets	3.50	2.90	2.55	2.48	13.50	15.17	13.50	16.97	16.69	15.75	15.17	...	...
Foreign liabilities[j]	1.55	1.99	1.97	0.33	1.07	0.55	1.07	1.15	0.57	0.27	0.55	...	...
Other banks	0.79	0.76	0.68	0.33	2.32	3.77	2.32	2.41	2.24	2.03	3.77	...	...
Claims on private sector	4.02	4.93	4.47	6.56	13.08	19.89	13.08	17.00	18.56	17.63	19.89	20.59	...
Bank Indonesia	0.86	0.86	0.77	1.77	2.46	1.39	2.46	2.96	3.63	2.21	1.39	1.48	...
Other banks	3.16	4.07	3.73	4.79	10.62	18.50	10.62	14.04	14.94	15.42	18.50	19.11	...
Claims on government[r]	9.48	15.33	21.42	31.24	36.51	36.88	36.51	32.27	34.33	32.43	36.88	...	...
Bank Indonesia	8.68	12.78	19.80	29.10	34.21	34.90	34.21	29.88	31.75	30.13	34.90	...	...
Other banks	0.02	1.69	0.67	1.03	0.90	0.50	0.90	0.86	1.04	0.80	0.50	...	...
Treasury currency	0.78	0.86	0.95	1.11	1.40	1.48	1.40	1.53	1.54	1.50	1.48	1.52	...
Exchange rate:													
Principal export rate	11.36	11.36– 13.57	22.7	30.3	36.0	45.0	36.0	36.0	36.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
Principal import rate	11.48– 22.95	11.48– 22.95	28.4– 42.6	37.9– 56.8	45.0– 67.5	45.0– 72.0	45.0– 67.5	45.0– 67.5	45.0– 67.5	45.0– 72.0	45.0– 72.0	45.0– 72.0	45.0– 72.0
Other import rate	34.42– 57.38	28.68– 57.38	56.8– 78.1	75.8– 104.2	90.0– 135.0	200.0	90.0– 135.0	90.0– 135.0	90.0– 135.0	200.0	200.0	200.0	200.0

18. CURRENCY AND BANKING *(Cont'd)*

End of period

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959 IV	1960 I	1960 II	1960 III	1960 IV	1961 Jan	1961 Feb
IRAN *(thousand million rials, 20th of last month of period)*													
Money supply	20.22	23.59	27.69	36.33	39.96	...	39.96	44.47	42.82	44.37	...	...	...
Currency: net active	17.71	20.78	24.26	27.79	30.48	...	30.43	34.30	32.74	34.68	...	...	...
Deposit money	2.51	2.81	3.44	7.00	9.49	...	9.49	101.7	10.08	9.69	...	...	...
Private time deposits	4.12	5.31	5.79	7.30	9.80	...	9.80	11.36	10.37	10.93	...	...	...
Government deposits	4.08	4.57	6.07	8.08	11.28	7.79	11.28	9.40	8.79	9.09	7.79	...	...
Bank debits Δ	15.33	16.80	18.20	20.71	20.62	...	20.74	20.61	20.26	...	...	...	...
Foreign assets[k] (National bank)	7.11	8.44	18.57	19.13	16.12	13.86	16.12	14.27	13.03	13.46	13.86	16.44	15.22
Claims on private sector	9.72	10.82	13.98	22.61	32.24	...	32.24	33.48	37.17	39.54	...	...	...
National Bank	5.72	7.45	8.37	12.73	15.87	18.67	15.87	16.00	17.46	18.92	18.67	18.64	18.69
Commercial banks	3.99	3.36	5.61	9.88	16.37	...	16.37	17.47	19.70	20.62	...	...	...
Claims on government	11.07	12.64	13.81	14.73	13.33	16.64	13.33	13.45	13.66	15.00	16.64	16.58	16.47
Claims on official entities (National bank)	6.24	6.88	9.09	12.27	15.60	15.71	15.60	16.25	16.92	16.18	15.71	15.51	15.65
Exchange rate: selling	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50	76.50
JAPAN *(thousand million yen)*													
Money supply	2,331	2,714	2,824	3,185	3,711	4,420	3,711	3,519	3,510	3,681	4,420	...	...
Currency: net active	627	721	750	795	604	1,097	604	752	822	800	1,097	1,109	1,130
Deposit money	1,705	1,993	2,074	2,390	3,107	3,323	3,107	2,767	2,688	2,881	3,323	...	...
Time deposits (other banks)	3,064	3,837	4,767	5,867	7,236	8,937	7,236	7,581	7,909	8,390	8,937	...	...
Government & Local Government	179	210	221	251	279	320	279	434	328	334	320	...	...
Bank of Japan	61	66	46	54	54	26	54	198	40	37	26	...	...
Other banks	118	144	175	197	225	294	225	236	288	297	294	...	...
Bank clearings Δ	2,750	3,342	4,264	4,745	4,775	5,581	5,134	5,037	5,327	5,577	6,380	5,820	6,352
Foreign assets	447	457	272	396	532	623	532	504	491	575	623	...	...
Bank of Japan	170	153	— 6	91	212	322	212	213	219	249	322	...	...
Foreign Exchange Fund	289	355	282	305	386	469	386	400	431	481	469	...	...
Other banks	— 12	— 51	— 4	—	— 67	—168	— 67	—110	—158	—155	—168	...	...
Claims on private sector	4,684	5,917	7,253	8,501	10,287	12,868	10,287	10,766	11,255	11,959	12,868	...	...
Claims on government	427	442	448	652	798	876	798	725	587	535	876	...	...
Rates of interest (*% per annum*)													
Call money rate (Tokyo) Δ	7.36	6.57	10.94	9.69	8.43	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.03	8.03
Yield of long-term gov't bonds[m] Δ	6.33	6.34	6.33	6.32	6.32	6.38	6.32	6.32	6.32	6.43	6.43	...	...
Exchange rate (*par rate*)[r]	360.8	360.8	360.8	360.8	359.8	359.6	359.8	359.6	361.8	359.6	359.6	359.6	359.6
KOREA, Republic of *(thousand million hwan)*													
Money supply	93.5	120.9	145.1	192.6	209.9	219.1	209.9	211.1	206.9	199.3	219.1	217.6	222.5
Currency: in circulation	58.8	73.4	86.2	111.1	123.8	139.4	123.8	111.7	117.9	123.6	139.4	128.5	132.0
Deposit money	34.7	47.6	59.1	81.5	86.3	79.7	86.3	99.4	89.0	75.7	79.7	89.1	90.5
Uncleared checks and bills	5.9	14.9	12.9	20.5	2.1	40.8	2.1	4.0	25.7	41.0	40.8	37.3	44.7
Time deposits[n]	10.0	16.9	17.6	24.0	63.4	62.1	63.4	80.3	74.0	62.6	62.1	67.6	58.4
Bank clearings Δ	107.4	207.7	201.2	226.9	292.3	399.2	322.2	360.1	361.9	404.9	469.7	516.8	527.3
Bank debits Δ	...	306.5	361.3	417.5	559.9	701.6	640.4	665.9	666.3	704.8	774.2	914.8	905.1
Government deposits	33.4	68.0	133.0	125.9	125.0	131.1	125.0	94.0	102.5	124.3	131.1	142.6	152.5
Counterpart funds	14.2	83.0	114.3	98.9	63.7	86.3	63.7	37.6	39.1	83.0	86.3	92.4	84.8
Foreign assets, Bank of Korea (*net*)	24.0	25.5	33.5	49.3	50.5	72.1	50.5	62.0	60.6	66.9	72.1	110.8	140.5
Gross foreign assets	47.4	48.6	57.0	72.4	72.7	100.9	72.7	90.6	89.3	96.2	100.9	155.4	199.2
Foreign liabilities[p]	23.4	23.1	23.5	23.1	22.2	28.8	22.2	28.7	28.9	29.3	28.8	44.6	58.7
Claims on private sector	42.7	76.9	113.5	162.8	187.0	246.8	187.0	212.0	209.9	218.1	246.8	251.6	256.9
Bank of Korea	5.5	5.8	5.9	5.4	5.9	5.8	5.9	7.9	6.8	6.5	5.8	8.9	11.5
Other banks	37.2	71.1	107.7	157.4	91.5	241.0	181.1	204.1	203.1	211.7	241.0	242.7	245.4
Claims on government	111.4	213.5	304.9	308.3	300.0	291.2	300.0	236.9	238.4	282.9	291.2	311.1	296.4
Bank of Korea	109.5	209.7	299.9	303.4	295.5	287.5	295.5	233.9	235.1	279.0	287.5	307.4	292.8
Other banks	1.9	3.7	5.0	4.9	4.5	3.7	4.5	3.0	3.3	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6
Claims on official entities	3.5	5.4	9.6	17.5	17.4	18.6	17.4	17.9	17.8	18.4	18.6	18.7	18.6
Bank of Korea	2.7	4.0	8.0	16.0	16.0	16.4	16.0	15.4	16.4	16.4	16.4	16.4	16.4
Commercial banks	0.8	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.4	2.2	1.4	1.5	1.4	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.2
Exchange rate (official)	500	500	500	500	500	650	500	650	650	650	650	1,000	1,300
PAKISTAN *(million rupees)*													
Money supply	4,369	4,921	5,234	5,502	5,762	6,169	5,762	5,886	5,856	5,738	6,169	...	6,166
Currency: in circulation	2,990	3,464	3,583	3,742	3,844	4,190	3,844	3,944	3,815	3,659	4,190	...	4,090
Deposit money	1,380	1,457	1,651	1,760	1,918	1,979	1,918	1,942	2,041	2,078	1,979	...	2,076
Time deposits	889	968	1,083	1,180	1,454	1,592	1,454	1,502	1,439	1,540	1,592	1,573	1,582
Bank clearings Δ	593	696	761	789	980	1,231	1,205	1,197	1,197	1,181	1,350	1,414	1,219
Government deposits	163	61	69	65	200	112	200	75	124	126	112	116	112
Foreign assets (State Bank of Pakistan)[q]	1,774	1,854	1,594	1,485	1,908	1,978	1,908	2,000	1,909	1,860	1,978	2,043	2,109
Claims on private sector (scheduled banks)	1,183	1,256	1,294	1,314	1,509	1,968	1,509	1,690	1,563	1,539	1,968	2,045	2,036
Claims on government[r]	2,612	3,218	4,044	4,439	4,505	4,699	4,505	4,518	4,517	4,644	4,699	4,699	4,698
State Bank of Pakistan	1,338	1,848	2,507	2,791	2,658	2,848	2,658	2,698	2,770	2,812	2,848	2,849	2,852
Other banks	1,036	1,119	1,260	1,367	1,558	1,612	1,558	1,521	1,517	1,614	1,612	1,611	1,607
Treasury currency[r]	238	261	276	280	288	239	288	299	229	217	239	238	239
Claims on provincial governments	122	117	228	256	271	326	271	221	301	270	326	241	238
State Bank of Pakistan	12	2	119	122	93	131	93	44	125	74	131	47	44
Scheduled banks	110	115	109	134	178	195	178	177	176	197	195	194	194
Rates of interest (*% per annum*)													
Call money rate Δ	1.45	2.04	2.03	1.66	1.53	3.42	1.44	3.85	3.32	2.38	4.11	...	...
Yield of long-term government bonds[s] Δ	3.15	3.15	3.20	3.20	3.25	3.50	3.32	3.47	3.48	3.50	3.56	3.56	3.65
Exchange rate (selling)	4.782	4.805	4.778	4.785	4.790	4.780	4.790	4.775	4.775	4.770	4.780	4.780	4.795

18. CURRENCY AND BANKING *(Cont'd)*

End of period

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1959	1960				1961	
							IV	I	II	III	IV	Jan	Feb
PHILIPPINES *(million pesos)*													
Money supply	1,336	1,499	1,598	1,738	1,842	1,902	1,842	1,810	1,800	1,790	1,902	1,872	1,922
Currency: net active	670	718	781	818	894	949	894	875	853	888	949	920	924
Deposit money	666	780	817	919	948	953	948	935	947	902	953	952	998
Private time deposits	586	658	803	868	1,032	1,158	1,032	1,029	1,035	1,087	1,158	1,195	1,216
Bank clearings Δ	614	739	876	915	*1,058*	...	1,050	1,127	...	...	...	1,406	1,208
Bank debits[t] Δ	921	1,145	1,335	1,492	1,768	*1,982*	1,860	1,985	1,960	...	2,001	1,978	1,616
Government deposits	185	274	166	224	278	...	278	351	390	349	...	...	...
Central Bank of the Philippines	52	105	54	153	207	...	207	256	297	273	...	...	...
Philippine National Bank	133	168	113	71	71	...	71	*95*	*93*	76	...	...	...
Foreign assets *(net)*	418	450	201	182	311	...	311	316	407	437	...	...	...
Central Bank	310	322	62	75	165	297	165	177	252	312	297	254	264
Other banks	108	128	139	107	146	...	146	139	155	125	...	...	...
Claims on private sector (other banks)	1,106	1,254	1,513	1,588	1,779	1,963	1,779	1,810	1,806	1,872	1,963	1,967	2,024
Claims on government	591	730	804	929	1,026	...	1,026	1,062	1,019	978	...	...	...
Claims on official entities	226	268	376	462	501	...	501	506	528	537	...	...	...
Central Bank of the Philippines[u]	185	198	315	393	418	...	418	422	442	453	...	...	...
Other banks	41	68	60	69	84	...	84	84	86	84	...	...	...
Exchange rate (selling)	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015	2.015
THAILAND *(million baht)*													
Money supply	7,227	7,728	8,197	8,452	9,076[r]	10,066	9,076[r]	9,306[r]	9,146[r]	9,404[r]	10,066	10,369	10,560
Currency: net active	5,179	5,424	5,573	5,504	5,785	6,045	5,785	5,904	5,593	5,708	6,045	6,248	6,500
Deposit money	2,048	2,304	2,624	2,948	3,292[r]	4,020	3,292[r]	3,403[r]	3,533[r]	3,696	4,020	4,121	4,060
Time deposits	776	1,192	1,469	1,770	1,899	2,331	1,899	1,994	2,072	2,239	2,331	2,366	2,388
Government deposits	516	588	639	679	880	1,446	880	926	928	984	1,446	1,612	1,405
Bank of Thailand	326	438	394	469	474	993	574	473	515	517	993	1,116	878
Deposit money banks	190	150	245	212	407	453	407	453	413	467	453	496	527
Bank clearings Δ	2,598	2,816	3,095	3,451	3,764	3,966	3,811	4,121	3,765	3,790	4,189	4,772	4,467
Bank debits	3,600	4,698	4,727	5,002	5,495	6,384	5,772	6,279	6,064	6,190	7,005	7,896	7,349
Foreign assets *(net)*	6,078	6,225	6,396	6,124	5,898	6,957	5,898	6,186	6,321	6,486	6,957	...	...
Bank of Thailand	4,759	5,065	5,401	5,303	5,203	5,802	5,203	5,340	5,388	5,415	5,802	6,002	6,285
Deposit money banks	67	− 80	− 31	− 4	−270	−248	−270	−167	−258	−322	−248	−221	−173
Exchange Fund	1,252	1,240	1,026	825	966	1,403	966	1,014	1,191	1,403	...	...	...
Claims on private sector	2,644	3,219	3,712	4,354	4,913	5,762	4,913	5,254	5,265	5,815	5,762	5,983	6,114
Claims on government[r]	4,554	5,674	5,552	5,974	6,520	4,586	6,520	6,482	5,977	5,969	4,586	4,719	...
Treasury bill rate (*% per annum*) Δ	2.26	2.28	2.27	2.91	2.99	3.35	2.99	2.99	2.97	2.99	4.41	4.41	4.41
Exchange rate (selling)	20.91	20.66	20.90	21.10	21.18	21.14	21.19	21.19	21.19	21.19	21.14	21.09	21.09
VIET-NAM, Republic of *(thousand million piastre)*													
Money supply	12.39	12.16	10.97	11.71	14.07	16.77	14.07	15.49	15.37	16.36	16.77	17.36	18.34
Currency: net active	6.78	8.26	7.56	7.86	8.91	11.23	8.91	9.80	10.06	10.69	11.23	11.71	12.57
Deposit money	5.62	3.90	3.41	3.86	5.16	5.54	5.16	5.69	5.31	5.67	5.54	5.65	5.77
Time deposits	0.70	1.26	0.85	1.08	1.15	1.28	1.15	1.07	1.02	1.22	1.28	1.30	1.26
Bank clearings Δ	3.13	2.86	3.20	3.21	3.43	4.10	3.66	3.83	3.98	4.21	4.38	4.92	...
Foreign assets *(net)*	4.29	4.58	4.70	5.66	6.19	7.39	6.19	6.58	6.59	7.21	7.39	7.29	7.16
Banque Nationale du Viet-Nam	4.36	4.62	4.40	5.33	5.84	7.26	5.84	6.33[r]	6.47	7.12	7.26	7.19	7.06
Other banks	−0.06	−0.04	0.30	0.33	0.35	0.13	0.35	0.25	0.12	0.09	0.13	0.10	0.10
Claims on private sector	1.62	1.81	3.22	3.01	3.67	4.34	3.67	3.99	4.15	4.35	4.34	5.08	5.59
Claims on government[r]	13.13	12.35	11.62	12.32	13.21	13.48	13.21	13.45	13.00	13.25	13.48	13.09	13.22
Exchange rate:													
Official rate	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00
Controlled free rate	—	—	73.00	73.50	73.50	73.50	73.50	73.50	73.50	73.50	73.50	73.50	73.50

GENERAL NOTE: *Net active currency:* Total currency outstanding less holdings in all banks including the central bank and in government treasuries. *Currency in circulation*: Total currency outstanding less holdings in all banks including the central bank. *Deposit money:* Private deposits in all banks, subject to cheque or withdrawable on demand, excluding inter-bank liabilities. *Government deposits:* Including government currency holdings. *Bank clearings:* Total value of cheques and other collection items cleared through clearing houses. *Claims on private sector:* Claims by the banking system arising from the rendering of loans and advances, discounting of bills, the holding of securities in private companies, etc. *Claims on government:* Holdings of government bonds, treasury bills and government guaranteed securities by the banking system, plus circulation of treasury currency. *Rates of interest:* Rates prevailing in the capital city, except for India, where Bombay rates are used. *Call money rate* is inter-bank rate on money at call. *Exchange rates* are shown in unit of national currency per US dollar.

For the detailed explanation see IMF: International Financial Statistics.

Δ Monthly averages or calendar months.

a. Deposits of State Boards in State Commercial Bank (excluding the State Agricultural Bank).

b. Including a constant amount of 99 million kyats, which is the value of a promissory note issued as cover for the currency issue.

c. 5 year treasury bonds.

d. Debits to demand deposits of private sector.

e. 3% national development loan 1965-1970 to earliest redemption date.

f. Including bank's holdings of stocks and debentures.

g. Including the counterpart of post office demand deposits.

h. Cheques sent out for local clearing and debits to current deposit accounts.

i. Running yield of 3% consols 1986 to earliest redemption date.

j. Payments agreement liabilities, mainly to Japan and the Netherlands.

k. Foreign assets were revalued in May 1957. The revaluation proceeds (7 billion rials) are held by the National Bank and are to be used for long term development.

m. Weighted yield (simple rate of interest) to latest redemption date of medium dated government bonds issued during the period stated.

n. Including deposits of local government and government institutions in commercial banks and non-governmental foreign currency deposits in Bank of Korea.

p. Clearing accounts with Japan.

q. Including outstanding assets receivable from the Reserve Bank of India under the partition agreements; excluding foreign assets of Banking Department.

s. Yield to maturity of 3% bonds 1968.

t. Total debits to checking account of private sector.

u. Including a constant amount of 107 million pesos from 1952, representing the difference between foreign assets transferred from the Treasury and its note and coin issue, for which the Bank assumed liability.

UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC BULLETIN FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Beginning with the ninth volume, for 1958-59, the Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East is issued quarterly, in June, September, December and March (instead of May, August, November and February). The March issue contains the annual **Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East.** The June and September issues contain articles and notes on subjects related to the Asian economy. The December issue features special studies and reports relating to economic development and planning. All four issues include a compendium of Asian economic statistics.

Annual subscription (including the Survey): US$4.00, sterling 28/6; Swiss francs 17.00.

Single copies:

For June, September or December issue—US$0.50, sterling 3/6; or Swiss francs 2.00

For March issue (Survey)—US$3.00, sterling 21; or Swiss francs 13.00

The Bulletin is available against payment in local currency, and standing orders may be placed with any distributor for United Nations publications (see list on back cover). Orders placed with the Sales and Circulation Section, United Nations, New York, U.S.A., are payable in dollars.

DISTRIBUTORS FOR UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

ARGENTINA
Editorial Sudamericana S.A., Alsina 500, Buenos Aires.
AUSTRALIA
Melbourne University Press, 369-371, Lonsdale St., Melbourne Cl, Victoria.
AUSTRIA
Gerold & Co., Graben 31, Wien, 1; B. Wüllerstorff, Markus Sittikusstrasse 10, Salzburg.
BELGIUM
Agence et Messageries de la Presse S.A., 14-22 rue du Persil, Bruxelles.
BOLIVIA
Librería Selecciones, Casilla 972, La Paz.
BRAZIL
Livraria Agir, Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo and Belo Horizonte.
BURMA
Curator, Government Book Depot, Rangoon.
CAMBODIA
Entreprise Khmère de Librairie, Imprimerie & Papeterie SARL, Phnom-Penh.
CANADA
Ryerson Press, 299 Queen St. West, Toronto.
CEYLON
Lake House Bookshop, The Associated Newspapers of Ceylon, Ltd., P. O. Box 244, Colombo.
CHILE
Editorial del Pacífico, Ahumada 57, Santiago; Librería Ivens, Casilla 205, Santiago.
CHINA
The World Book Co. Ltd., 99 Chungking Road, 1st Section, Taipei, Taiwan; The Commercial Press Ltd., 211 Honan Road, Shanghai.
COLOMBIA
Librería América, Medellín; Librería Buchholz Galería, Bogotá.
COSTA RICA
Imprenta y Librería Trejos S.A., Apartado 1313, San José.
CUBA
La Casa Belga, O'Reilly 455, La Habana.
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
Ceskoslovensky Spisovatel, Národní Trida 9, Praha 1.
DENMARK
Einar Munksgaard, Ltd., Norregade 6, Kobenhavn, K.
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
Librería Dominicana, Mercedes 49, Ciudad Trujillo.
ECUADOR
Librería Científica, Guayaquil and Quito.
EL SALVADOR
Manuel Navas y Cía., 1a. Avenida sur 37, San Salvador.
ETHIOPIA
Mr. George P. Giannopoulos, International Press Agency, P.O. Box No. 120, Addis Ababa.
FINLAND
Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, 2 Keskuskatu, Helsinki.
FRANCE
Editions A. Pédone, 13, rue Soufflot, Paris V.
GERMANY
R. Eisenschmidt, Kaiserstrasse 59, Frankfurt/Main; Elwert & Meurer, Hauptstrasse 101, Berlin—Schoneberg; Alexander Horn, Spiegelgasse 9, Wiesbaden; W. E. Saarbach, Gertrudenstrasse 30, Köln 1.
GHANA
University Bookshop, University College of Ghana, P. O. Box 4, Legon.
GREECE
Kauffmann Bookshop, 28 Stadion Street, Athènes.
GUATEMALA
Sociedad Económico Financiera, Edificio Briz. Despacho 207, 6a Av. 14-33, Zona 1, Guatemala City.
HAITI
Librairie "A la Caravelle," Boîte Postale 111-B, Port-au-Prince.
HONDURAS
Librería Panamericana, Tegucigalpa.
HONG KONG
The Swindon Book Co., 25 Nathan Road, Kowloon.
ICELAND
Bokaverzlun Sigfusar Eymondssonar H. F., Austurstraeti 18, Reykjavik.
INDIA
Orient Longmans, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, New Delhi and Hyderabad.
Oxford Book & Stationery Co., New Delhi and Calcutta; P. Varadachary & Co., Madras.
INDONESIA
Pembangunan, Ltd., Gunung Sahari 84, Djakarta.
IRAN
"Guity", 482 Avenue Ferdowsi, Teheran.
IRAQ
Mackenzie's Bookshop, Baghdad.
IRELAND
Stationery Office, Dublin.
ISRAEL
Blumstein's Bookstores Ltd., 35 Allenby Road and 48 Nachlat Benjamin Street, Tel-Aviv.
ITALY
Librería Commissionaria Sansoni, Via Gino Capponi 26, Firenze.
JAPAN
Maruzen Company, Ltd., 6 Tori-Nichome, Nihonbashi, Tokyo.
JORDAN
Joseph & Bahous & Company, Dar-Ul-Kutub, P. O. Box 66 Amman.
KOREA
Mr. Chin-Sook Chung, President, Eul-Yoo Publishing Company, Ltd., 5, 2-Ka, Chongno, Seoul.
LEBANON
Khayat's College Book Cooperative, 92-94 Rue Bliss, Beirut.
LIBERIA
J. Momolu Kamara, Monrovia.
LUXEMBOURG
Libraire J. Trausch - Schummer, Place du Théâtre, Luxembourg.
MEXICO
Editorial Hermes S.A., Ignacio Mariscal 41, México, D.F.
MOROCCO
Bureau d'études et de participations industrielles, rue Michaux-Bellaire, Rabat.
NETHERLANDS
N.V. Martinus Nijhoff, Lange Voorhout 9, 's-Gravenhage.
NEW ZEALAND
United Nations Association of New Zealand, C.P.O. 1011, Wellington.
NORWAY
Johan Grundt Tanum Forlag, Kr. Augustsgt, 7A, Oslo.
PAKISTAN
The Pakistan Cooperative Book Society, Dacca, East Pakistan (and at Chittagong); Thomas & Thomas, Karachi, 3; Publishers United Ltd., Lahore.
PANAMA
José Menéndez, Apartado 2052, Av. 8A, sur 21-58.
PARAGUAY
Agencia de Librerías de Salvador Nizza, Calle Pte. Franco No. 39-43 Asunción.
PERU
Librería Internacional del Perú, S.A., Lima.
PHILIPPINES
Alemar's Book Store, 769 Rizal Avenue, Manila.
PORTUGAL
Livraria Rodrigues, 186 Rua Aurea Lisboa.
SINGAPORE
The City Book Store, Ltd., Winchester House, Collyer Quay.
SPAIN
Librería Bosch, 11 Ronda Universidad, Barcelona; Librería Mundi-Prensa, Castello, 37, Madrid.
SWEDEN
C. E. Fritze's Kungl. Hovbokhandel A-B, Fredsgatan 2, Stockholm.
SWITZERLAND
Librarie Payot S.A., Lausanne, Genève; Hans Raunhardt, Kirchgasse 17, Zurich 1.
THAILAND
Pramuan Mit Ltd., 55 Chakrawat Road, Wat Tuk, Bangkok.
TURKEY
Librairie Hachette, 469 Istiklal Caddesi, Beyoglu, Istanbul.
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
Van Schaik's Bookstore (Pty.), Ltd., Box 724, Pretoria.
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
Mezhdunarodnaya Knyiga, Smolenskaya Ploshchad, Moscow.
UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC
Librairie La Renaissance d'Egypte 9 Sharia Adly Pasha, Cairo.
UNITED KINGDOM
H.M. Stationery Office, P.O. Box 569, London, S.E. 1 (Edinburgh 2-13a Castle St.; Birmingham 3-2 Edmund St.; Bristol 1-Tower Lane; Manchester 2-39 King St.; Cardiff-109 St. Mary St.; Belfast-80 Chichester St.)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Sales Section, Publishing Service, United Nations, New York.
URUGUAY
Representación de Editoriales, Prof. H. D'Elía, Av. 18 de Julio 1333, Montevideo.
VENEZUELA
Librería del Este, Ave. Miranda, No. 52, Edf. Galipan, Caracas.
VIET-NAM
Librairie-Papeterie Xuân Thu 185 rue Tu-Do, B.P. 283, Saigon.
YUGOSLAVIA
Cankarjeva Zalozba, Ljubljana, Slovenia; Drzavno Preduzece, Jugoslovenska Knjiga, Terazije 27/11, Beograd; "Prosvjet," Izdavacka Knjizara, No. 5, Trg. Bratstva I Jedinstva, Zagreb.

Orders and inquiries from countries where distributors have not yet been appointed may be sent to: Sales and Circulation Section, United Nations, New York, U.S.A.; or Sales Section, United Nations, Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland.

Printed in Hong Kong

Price: US$0.50; 3/6 stg; Sw. Fr. 2.00 (or equivalent in other currencies)

June 1961 — 3,475